UNIVERSITÉ DE GAND

RECUEIL DE TRAVAUX

PUBLIÉS PAR

LA FACULTÉ DE PHILOSOPHIE ET LETTRES

21me FASCICULE

FAUSTUS-NOTES

A

SUPPLEMENT TO THE COMMENTARIES

ON

MARLOWE'S „TRAGICALL HISTORY OF D. FAUSTUS"

BY

H. LOGEMAN, Ph. D.

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH PHILOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GHENT.

GAND

LIBRAIRIE H. ENGELCKE

21, RUE DES FOULONS, 21

1898

BERGEN OP ZOOMSCHE

BOEK-, COURANT- & HANDELSDRUKKERIJ

B 17, LIEVEVROUWESTRAAT, B 17

(NEDERLAND)

FAUSTUS-NOTES

A

SUPPLEMENT TO THE COMMENTARIES

ON

MARLOWE'S „TRAGICALL HISTORY OF D. FAUSTUS"

RECUEIL DE TRAVAUX

PUBLIÉS PAR

LA FACULTÉ DE PHILOSOPHIE ET LETTRES
DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE GAND

EXTRAIT DU RÈGLEMENT

Les travaux des professeurs, anciens professeurs, chargés de cours et anciens chargés de cours seront publiés sous la responsabilité personnelle de leurs auteurs.

Ceux des élèves et anciens élèves seront publiés en vertu d'une décision de la Faculté.

To my Wife.

Therefore, sone, y bydd the
Wyrche with thy wyfe, as reson ys.

How the wise man taught his son.

PREFACE.

The custom that requires a man, who is guilty of a new publication, to try to justify its appearance, seems to me a very laudable one. For, although I may be allowed to say that the justification in this case must lie in the little book itself, so that it is not for me to speak about what will be thought of it, yet it gives me an opportunity of preventing a possible misconception as to the aim of this „suppiement to the commentaries on *D. Faustus*".

These investigations consist principally of a series of notes on the text of Marlowe's grandest drama — I do not think the word too strong — and are merely the writing out for the press of my lectures on this subject in the winter-semester of 1896, with one or two additions and a great many omissions, — *viz.* of all that did not belong so much before the public as in the class-room, before an exclusively non-English audience. If I have not gone far enough in these excisions — as, I am afraid, may here and there prove to be the case, — I hope that this account of the genesis of these Notes will save me from too slashing a criticism.

The general considerations found in the second Chapter are the natural outcome of the Notes by which they are preceded, and if, having become firmly rooted in my mind before I set to preparing this publication for the press, they have naturally influenced the first chapter to some extent, this is the case only in so far as the tone adopted there could be one of greater confidence. It will hence, I hope, be clear that there is no *petitio principii* in my treatment of this matter and that the aim of the following pages in essentially to contribute

somewhat towards the elucidation of the text of *D. Faustus*, not to bear out some foregone conclusions about the play or its sources. For all that, I think the second chapter will prove of interest.

Considering the polemical character of these Notes, it can do no harm to add that although I must necessarily quote names, I do not ‚attack' — an ugly word — persons so much as opinions. I should be sorry to have a superficial reader conclude, that I think meanly of say, Professor Ward, simply because his name occurs on almost every page and in nine cases out of ten in some connection, indicative of dissent. I may add that, if I had to occupy myself with Ward more than with all the other commentators together, it is for a reason which is to his honour rather than anything else, *viz.* his being ‚the biggest boy in the crowd', to whom it is confessedly prudent to give the first place, when it comes to settling matters. And what I here say of Professor Ward holds in a lesser degree — I confess, in some cases in a much lesser degree — of the other commentators.

I would here state emphatically — what I hope will be sufficiently apparent from the ensuing pages — that I have a great admiration for Professor Ward's edition of our play. It is all the greater pity then, that some passages have been treated inadequately by him, as well as by others. I do not claim to have settled the matter under consideration definitely anywhere. I shall already be glad to find that I have pointed in the right direction for the solution of some difficulties.

I do not think it superfluous to repeat what I have already stated in the body of the work (p. 144) that, if the promised edition of the English prose-history (ed. 1592) is not speedily forthcoming, I shall take an early opportunity of publishing it myself. For it will be apparent from the discrepancies between the oldest extant text and the edition published by Thoms, that a reprint is urgently needed.

And after speaking about what I have done and what I may possibly do some day, I may as well refer to what I fondly hope nót to have done. I am thinking of what might make my readers exclaim with l. 439 of our text:

God forgiue me, he speakes Dutch fustian!

Ghent, Belgium, June 1898. H. LOGEMAN.

H. LOGEMAN,

FAUSTUS-NOTES.

CHAPTER I.

Notes to the A and B texts.

L.L. I. seq.q. (Chorus 1—6)

Not marching now in fields of *Thracimene*,
Where Mars did mate the Carthaginians,
Nor sporting in the dalliance of loue,
In courts of kings, where state is overturnd,
Nor in the pompe of prowd audacious deedes,
Intends our Muse *etc.*

It was suggested to me that, the battle of the *lacus Trasimenus* being a very important one, the whole of this line should stand for *battle, war*, in which case the line would of course mean: „we are not now going to speak of war", or some such thing. To see that this view is unlikely, it is only necessary to compare a modern case. We can hardly imagine say, Leipsic, or Waterloo to be used in the same meaning. The whole tenour of the passage on the contrary requires that we shall continue to look upon this reference as one to a definite play in which this famous defeat of the Romans was either prominently referred to or actually brought upon the stage. But if this passage refers to one particular play, it is difficult to believe that l.l. 3—5 do not. We must therefore look for a play or plays in which we find *dalliance of loue*, *overturning of states* and *audacious deeds*. I am surprised

to see that none of the commentators have thought of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*. Surely, if we remember that these two „Tragicall Discourses" tell us of Cosroe crowned instead of Mycetes and being overthrown [1]) by Tamburlaine (p.p. 12, 38—40), of the „overturning" of Bajazeth and all his „kings" (p. 56) of the taking of Damascus, Egypt, the realm of Sigismond (p.p. 83, 93, 122), etc. etc. (cf. p. p. 114, 165, 173); if we call to mind the love-scenes between Tamburlaine and Zenocrate on the one hand (p.p. 16, 44) and those between Theridamas and Olympia on the other (p. 161); if we mention but some few of the incidents which may truly be qualified as *prowd audacious deedes*, such as the astounding way in which Tamburlaine gains Theridamas over to his side, whereas he has been sent out to give Tamburlaine battle; the manner in which Bajazeth in a cage, is being dragged along, at the heels of his conqueror, if we remember all this, we can have no difficulty in believing that Marlowe had his own play before his mind's eye when writing these lines.

If we compare the opening lines of other plays, we no doubt often find the author referring to the difference between his play and those of other authors; cf. e. g. Greene's (?[2]) *Selimus:*

> No feigned toy nor forged Tragedie
> Gentles, we here present unto your view
> But . . . *etc.*
>
> (ed. Grosart Temple Dram.)

and Marlowe's oft quoted words

> From iygging vaines of riming mother wits,
> And such conceits as clownage keepes in pay,
> Weele lead you to the stately tent of War . . . *etc.*

[1]) My references are to A. Wagner's ed. of this play. (Heilbronn 1885.

[2]) See the Athenæum, April 16, 1898, p. 512.

beginning the Tamburlaine - prologue may serve as an other illustration. For all that I do not think that there could be any *a priori* objection to supposing any author to refer to his own work, when, as is the case here, all blame is entirely absent. I do not know Mr. Fleay's reasons [1]) for assuming the reference to be to a (lost) play, but the assumption certainly agrees with my own hypothesis as indicated above. We must conclude then, that Marlowe himself was the author of this play, now lost, on the *fields of Thracimene*. For it is hardly likely — not to say impossible — that l.l. 1, 2 should refer to some one else's work and l.l. 3—6 to Marlowe's.

l. 2. (Chorus 2). Where Mars did mate the Carthaginians.

Commentators such as Dyce who explain *mate* here as *defeat* must necessarily take Mars to stand somehow for the Roman army and as it was not the Carthaginians who were defeated in that battle, but the Romans, must suppose — see Ward[3] p. 124 — „the poet's memory to have been at fault." Prof. W. Wagner who prints *Carthaginians* in his text, explains it as though it read *Carthaginian*, and taking *mated* in the sense of *opposed*, *fought with* (viz. „the warlike Carthaginian, Hannibal.") says *Mars* is „the founder of the Roman race and hence their representative," and that „the extraordinary feature of the victory gained by Hannibal is that it was so to speak, gained over the

[1]) See Professor Ward's *Faustus*, Introduction, Appendix p. CXLI. I hope that Mr. Fleay has some other arguments than those indicated in this Appendix. For that „the Hannibal plays of 1598 and 1601 are later in date than any of these „additions" can only be an argument to those who blindly accept all the *magistri verba*. For here as little as anywhere else does Mr. Fleay go in for that scientific luxury: the giving of proofs for one's „facts".

god of war himself." Although I have nothing new to add to what has already been said about this line, I have the less hesitation in rescuing Van de Velde's [1]) explanation out of apparent oblivion, as I have arrived (if I rightly interpret my notes), independently of him at the same conclusion. Mars should, I think, be taken as *the* god of war, *i. e.* the help he gives, success in warfare; and *mate* as *to side with.*

The line would then of course mean: „Where success in warfare was on the side of the Carthaginians." Prof. Ward agrees with Mr. Bullen in thinking that „such a use of the word is extremely doubtful." Strictly speaking such a use may be doubtful, but the application of to mate, = to marry, to match to be on the same side, *i. e.* the semasiology involved can hardly excite wonder. Think of to „espouse" a cause.

l. 6. (Chorus 6). Intends our muse to daunt his heavenly verse.

All editors agree with Dyce as to substituting *vaunt*, the reading of the third Quarto for *daunt*, which assuredly gives no sense. I wonder however if *vaunt* gives the right one. Is there any reason for making the author say that his Muse *glories in* or *boasts of* her verse? [2]) Even Prof. Ward's reference to Greene's „strange comic shows, such as proud Roscius *vaunted* before the Roman Emperors" (Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, VII, 10, 11,) seems to me to point to *vaunt* = to boast rather than, as the context seems to require, = to utter. Some other emendation is therefore perhaps necessary but it is with great diffidence that I suggest *to vent.* It is found *passim* = to utter in Shakespeare

[1]) Van de Velde's *Marlowe's Faust* etc., Breslau (1870) p. 129.

[2]) It must be remembered that *heavenly* as Wagner rightly explains, refers to the Muse.

(see *e.g.* Coriolanus, III. 1. 258:) His heart's his mouth. What his breast forges, that his tongue must vent). It is true that on this supposition I cannot account for the misprint *daunt*, but it is equally unintelligible on the other. *(daunt* for *vaunt).*

l.l. 7, 8. we must performe
(Chorus 7 8.) The forme of *Faustus* fortunes....

That Marlowe was fond of such jingles as Ward says is born out by the instances given in his edition and by those Breymann gives in the Engl. Stud. vol. 12 p. 446. If Wagner had remembered that an Englishman even yet rather favours them, he would prudently have abstained from qualifying them as careless expressions. He might then have looked in a different light on an other case in point (not mentioned by Ward) in l.l. 16, 17 where *grac't* (see *infra*) occurs twice, and which according to Wagner (p. 102) constitutes „an awkward repetition."

Form = outline, plan; cf. Twelfth Night (1. 2. 55): The form of my intent. cf. A true and certaine report of the beginning, proceedings, overthrowes and now present estate of Captaine Ward and Danseker, the two late famous pirates by Andrew Barker (B. M. press-mark: C. 27. C. 6), London, 1609 p. 2:

the manner of his first going to sea and the forme that he used in undertaking these courses. And see the N. E. D. *in voce.*

l. 9. (Chorus l. 9).
To patient Iudgements we appeale our plaude.

Plaud, as Wagner has observed, is not found elsewhere. But it must in no way be considered suspect. It may be explained as an aphetic form of *applaud.* See the N. E. D. *in v.* where instances of from 1598--1636 will be found. See some aphetic forms in Dr. L.

Kellner, *Zur Sprache Marlowe's*. Wien, 1887, § 26. There may be some influence at work here of such words as *to plaud* (= latin plaudo; cf. Enc. Dict. *in v.*) and the well-known *plaudit*, but of course there need not be.

Ward thinks the line harsh, as it stands and looks with favour on Breymann's suggestion that we should read *for* instead of *our*. This indubitably makes it smoother in *our* eyes, of a 19th. century-reader. But there should be no difficulty, if we remember that *appeal* besides = to appeal for, also stands for *to remove to a higher tribunal*; cf. the N. E. D. *in voce* sub 1°. *e. g.* Reynard the Foxe (ed. Arber p. 76): *I appele this mater into the court to fore our lord the Kyng.*

I. 12. (Chorus 12.) Rhodes.

The translator of the German F. B. changed *Rod* (= Roda, near Weimar) into Rhode. As the *Rhodes* of our text is nearer to *Rhode* of the E.F.B. than to the Rod of the G. F. B., E. Schmidt (in Lemcke's Jahrbuch 14, 55) quotes this as a case in point to prove that Marlowe's play is founded on the English F. B. Although we shall find this to be true, this case does not prove it and hardly even helps to do so. For just as the author of the E. F. B. through a mixing up of forms distilled *Rhode* out of Rod, so Marlowe, supposing him to have had the G. F. B. before him might have committed the same „mistake". It is remarkable in this conjunction that in Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* the word *road* is several times spelt *Rhode* and *Rhoad*. (See l.l. 84, 120, 180 and 679 of A. Wagner's ed. Heilbronn 1889). It would appear then that, whether or no under the influence of the name of the island Rhodes, an *h* often crept into the word at that time, *i. e.* that the regular Eng-

lish spelling was what we should now call a mistaken one.

l. 13. (Chorus 13.) . . . . to Wertenberg he went.

Most Edd. change this into *Wittenberg*, which would be admissible only on the supposition that it was nothing but a mistake. It is however more than that: it is a blunder, which as it helps towards determining the state of knowledge in those times must stand. It is tempting to say that this confusion of the name of the (then) Duchy with that of the University town may have been instrumental in bringing about the impression that Faustus was born in Württemberg (at Knittlingen) but this seems unlikely in view of the fact that it's just the older authorities that mention Knittlingen. See Ward[3] p. LXXV. It is only prudent to add that the confusion spoken of seems to have been pretty general. (See l.l. 116,141.)

l. 15 (Chorus 15) he profites in Diuinitie.

There is of course not the slightest difficulty in *to profit* = to make progress, but a brace of instances of *to profit in* may not be ruled out of order. See: *profit you in what you read?* Taming of the Shrew, IV 2, 6, and: *by my foes I profit in the knowledge of myself* Twelfth Night V. 21.

l. 16. (Chorus 16.) The fruitfull plot of Scholerisme grac't.

For *grac't—grac't* in l.l. 16, 17, see *ante* n. to l.l. 7, 8. Wagner's difficulty about *scholerism* has been removed by Bullen, so what difficulty remains lies in *grac't.* Ward paraphrases: the fruitful garden of scholership being adorned by him. On this supposition we must either take the line to stand for: „*having* grac't the plot, and for this omission I cannot recall

any analogon; or look upon it as short for: the plot, having been" or „being grac'd by him". A double ellipsis of *being* and *by him* is of course not impossible, but I prefer as much simpler Breymann's conjecture (Engl. studiën 12, 446) who takes *grac't* to stand for *graz'd*. The whole line is then an absolute construction and we have to assume only a single ellipsis. Prof. Ward is shocked by Breymann's „too daring" equation (in spelling) of *grac't* and *grazed*. We may however either suppose (Breymann's original) *graz'd* to have been changed by the printer to *grac't* under the influence of *grac't* in the next line, or we may compare Tamburlaine l. 1429: *He raceth all his foes with fire and sword;* ib. l. 1631. *To race and scatter thy inglorious crue* and our own text l. 704 *race* for *rase* which analoga would incline me to look upon the spelling-difference as admissible. For ‚to graze a garden' (plot) cf. Dryden's: „He gave my kine to graze the flowery plain." (Enc. Dict.).

l. 18. (Chorus 18).
Excelling all whose sweete delight disputes.

Dyce, Wagner, Bullen and Ward leave it, but I do not understand the explanations given. Wagner says it is poetical for „who sweetly delight in disputing" and Ward has what is practically the same thing. An interpretation which derives its strength from being made out to be poetical is always difficult to attack. The non believer can only say that he does not see it. It may be so, but it seems to me utterly too-too poetical. Dr. Koeppel (see Eng. Stud. 12, 447) inverts the order of the two principal words, reading „whose sweete disputes delight". Prof. Breymann hospitably receives this reading into his text, and Prof. Ward smiles upon it, calling it (p. 125) „very seductive".

Apart from the less important circumstance, however, that it is not so much the ‚disputes' which ‚delight' as the disputants, I think we cannot let the collocation *sweet disputes* pass, although something very much like it (sweetly can dispute = sweetly disputed) is found in the B-text. Nor does Breymann himself seem to be altogether satisfied with it. At least he asks, in his notes, if we must perhaps read: ‚who sweetly like disputes'. If we have to change at all ‚whose sweet delight is dispute' being nearest the reading of the First Quarto, would perhaps deserve preference. For completeness' sake, I mention Kellner's view who says (Engl. Studiën, 14, 139) that *are* is omitted. This does not seem to help us much.

l. 20. (Chorus 20.) Of a selfe conceit.

Professor Breymann in a note to his ed. asks: ‚and of'? As *of a. s. c.* comes to the same as the first part of the line (*swolne with cunning*), I would advocate to leave *and* out. For it would be necessary only if *of a. s. c.* meant something different from the first part of the line.

l. 28. (Chorus 28.) this the man.

Besides the passages quoted by Messrs. Ward & Wagner, Dr. Horace Furness' Variorum ed. of Romeo & Juliet (p. 429) may with advantage be consulted.

l. 29. (I. 1). Settle thy studies *Faustus.*

That meaning of *to settle* which comes nearest to what the context requires is to *conclude.* Hence the line means: Conclude thy (various preparatory) studies (observe the plural) and begin (l. 30) to ‚devote (thy) self to one definite line of study instead of (l. 29) ranging through the whole extent of science' (Wagner).

l.l. 40. seq. Bid Oncaymaeon farewell, *Galen* come: (I. 12 seq.) Seeing, *ubi desinit philosophus, ibi incipit medicus.*

See Dr. Adamson's interesting suggestion *apud* Ward[1] p. 130. Whether we accept *economy* on the strength of this explanation, or Mr. Bullen's conjecture *on kai mê on* — truly a brilliant one because so simple — on either supposition the context created by l. 40 for the next would seem to me to exclude the interpretation of *philosophus* as philosophus naturalis *i. e.* physicus. Dr. Adamson says (*l. c.* p 131 n. 13) this is the ‚commonly recognised translation or adaptation of a sentence in Aristotle.' There, I take it, although Ward does not expressly say so, *philosophus* is really used = *physicus*. For all that, the sentence being quoted may as a quotation be *applied* either through ignorance or on purpose in a slightly different sense, viz. that of the *mental* Philosopher, which must be meant here by the *philosophus*. cf. l. 41.

l. 47. (I 19.) Is not thy common talke sound Aphorismes.

Will Prof. Ward kindly explain why *sound* here is an ‚inept' reading? Dyce calmly prints *found*. Bullen prints *found* whilst indicating that *sound* is the reading of the two first Qq [1]) but without vouchsafing an explanation. How would they and Ward explain *found Aphorisms* here? And surely, even if it could be satisfactorily explained, *sound* should stand if it can be interpreted! Wagner explains it = never failing. Perhaps *effective, good* (cf. sound advice, sound principles) would be slightly better; cf. l. 89: a sound magician. I am glad to see that Breymann too (Engl. Studiën 12, 448) rejects the reading *found*.

---

[1]) Bullen says that *found* is the reading of the ‚ed. 1616'. He is mistaken; the whole line is absent there!

cf. Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay 2, 175; 4, 52; 9, 163; 11, 21; 11, 107 for some of these aphorisms, in the more general sense of the word. (See Ward p. 132).

l. 48. (I 20.) thy bills.

Ward explains this word as referring ‚not so much to ordinary prescriptions, as to the advertisements by which, as a migratory physician he had been in the habit of announcing his advent'. It is difficult to see how the advertisement (of his arrival) *as such* could have made (l. 49) ‚whole Citties' escape the plague. But as these ‚advertisements' may have contained his ‚system of cure' — which Ward gives as an alternative explanation — it would seem they may be described as *prescriptions*.

The receipts with which he ‚did great cures' are mentioned in the E. F. B. (Thoms p. 167 = Spiess p. 13.)

l. 64. (I. 35.) The deuill and illiberall for me.

No one can for a moment doubt the necessity, I think, of Dyce's emendation *too servile and*, etc. cf. l. 124 (I 95), where the word is applied by Faustus to his spirits.

Verwey's Dutch translation of this passage is perhaps too free, but excellently renders the spirit in which Faustus utters these words:

't Is studie van een schrielen kruienier
Die loenscht van 't telkens naar zijn spaarpot zien.
'k Word wee van dat bekrompene geknoei.
(*See* de Nieuwe Gids, October 1887.)

l. 65. (I 36.) When all is done .....

See Macbeth ed. Wagner l. 1088 (III 4, 67): When all 's done, you look but on a stoole; M. N. Dream III 1, 15: I believe we must leave the killing out,

when all is done; Florio's Montaigne (Temple Classics), III, 271: For, when all is done, whatsoever is not as we are, is not of any worth.

For the semasiology, cf. similar expressions such as *when all is said* (Florio's Montaigne *u. s.* p. 58) and *after all.*

l. 74. (I, 45.) Che sera, sera.

Marlowe englishes this in his Edw. II; cf. Dyce p. 212 a. *Well, that shall be shall be.* ‚That will be shall be' is the title of a play acted at the Rose theatre, Dec. 30, 1596; cf. Fleay, *A Chronicle History of the London Stage* p. 100. See also *(Green's?) Selimus*, ed. Grosart (Temple Dramatists) l. 119: *But what must be, cannot choose but be done.*

l. 78. (I. 49).

Lines, circles, sceanes, letters and characters.

The propriety of *sceanes,* in this line seems extremely doubtful. The commentators quote, it is true, one more passage in which *sceanes* occurs (curiously enough in the same spelling), but they do not vouchsafe to give the meaning. Ward even says, it appears to have no special meaning. No wonder then that on the one hand the translators leave it out — with the one exception of Mr. Verwey, who very happily, I venture to think, hits upon *figuur* — and that Dr. Adamson, Ward's astrological authority does not believe in *sceanes* and proposes *seals* (in which sense?) as an emendation. The easiest process would be to leave it out altogether, — as is done by the B.-texts!

But as an emendation seems necessary, we must look out for a term of astrology, not too different as to the *ductus literarum,* and I would then propose *scheme,* which the Enc. Dictionary defines as a „repre-

sentation or diagram of the aspects of the celestial bodies; an astrological figure" (cf. Verwey, *ut supra*) „or diagram of the heavens." It is remarkable that in the one other reference where *sceanes* occurs, it is changed into *scheme* in the second edition. (Bullen p. 215). Observe that the equivalent of *schemes* is found in Marlowe's original, cf. Thoms p. 168: being expert in using his vocabula, *figures*, characters etc. (Spiess and Milchsack: *figuras*).

l. 90. (I 61.)

Heere *Faustus* trie thy braines to gaine a deitie.

The reading of B *tire* my *braines* is decidedly wrong, but it remains doubtful whether *trie* or *tire* thy *braines* must be preferred. Everything depends upon whether we can or cannot explain *trie*, the reading of the two oldest texts.

As *try* means to strain, to use too much, very much — cf. the modern phrase: It is very trying to the eye — I fail to see why we should reject the reading. At the same time the meaning *to use overmuch* lying so close to *to fatigue*, the reading — or shall we say misprint? — *tire* would be easily explained.

l. 91 (I 62.) *Wagner* commend me *etc.*

If we leave this line as in all the Quartos we have the difficulty that no reason can then be seen why Wagner should enter — except the one that he was wanted! Moreover the stage-direction *Enter Wagner* could very well have been found and so printed, before he is expected to enter. This is of course very often the case, especially when plays are printed from prompters' copies. I think therefore that Dyce's conjecture should be adopted.

l. 92. (l. 63). The Germaine *Valdes* and *Cornelius*.

As there would seem to be no discoverable reason why Faustus, being himself a German, should distinguish Valdes as such, it has been suggested that Germaine should be a mistake for Hermann. In the sphere of thought of those who look upon the two ‚deerest friends' as historical personages, another objection may be brought forward, against the traditional *Germaine*, *viz* that Cornelius, who has been identified as a German would on this interpretation be emphatically said not to be one and the reading „The Germans, Valdes and Cornelius" to which this objection could at least not be urged is of course as unwarrantable as l. 92 such as it stands. And it will be clear that Hermann does not suffice as an emendation and that we must then go further and read: To Hermann Valdes *etc.* But I wish to ask if this reason — *supra* — is entirely undiscoverable. May not Marlowe have lost sight here of the fact that Faustus was a German himself, *i. e.* may not Marlowe have spoken as himself rather than as Faustus? Surely graver charges than this one have been preferred against him. It is true that in l. 120 we have him speak of „our land" meaning Germany (inclusive of the Netherlands) but in l. 140 we find a usage of the word German which although undoubtedly slightly less objectionable than in the line under consideration, is yet somewhat strange. The „Germaine Church in a conversation of three Germans seems to lend colour to my view that a certain confusion existed in Marlowe's mind and that he did not quite clearly distinguish between himself and his creation.

On the other hand: is it necessary that Marlowe as all editors would have it, should be thinking here of historical personages? Cornelius has been identified,

it is true, as „the famous Henry Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim, of whom Delrio states Faust to have been a friend and companion" and who was „accounted a magician" (Ward[1] p. 113) but surely we have no proof that Marlowe had cognisance of Delrio's statement or of this fact. At the most Marlowe's knowledge of this historical Cornelius can have been but superficial as in l.l. 144, 145, this selfsame Agrippa is alluded to as dead. And the search for Valdes has hitherto proved vain. And if we dare to answer my question in the negative, most difficulties disappear for then there is no objection to the reading „To Hermann Valdes and Cornelius" except that it seems odd that Marlowe should have fixed upon such a double name. If this is too strange, the assumption of a confusion in Marlowe's mind is the only way out of the difficulty. We shall come across a similar mixing up of Marlowe and his creations lower down, — see note to l. 159, — and in connection with the same Valdes.

l. 96. *Enter the good Angell and euill Angell.*

„It is very curious" says Prof. Ward (p. Lix) that in [the German ballad on Doctor Faust] the Good Angel, who does not appear in the Faustbuch, is introduced.

This certainly seems curious and we conclude that it would repay the trouble to inquire more fully into the history of this German ballad of „an unknown but doubtless early date" (Ward). The context where the above remarks are made cannot but be misleading to the Faustus-student as they naturally suggest that Prof. Ward looks upon this ballad as early enough to make it a contemporary of the English Ballad and Marlowe's play.

If this ballad were indeed as old as that, we should have had to inquire whether we must consider the presence of the Good Angel in it as having been introduced from Marlowe's play or conversely, whether that play could have been furnished by the ballad with the Good Angel ‚motive.' Had Prof. Ward studied the very interesting monograph on the German ‚Volkslieder' of Dr. Faust [1]) which he himself quotes in a note to the passage cited, he would have found reason to modify his statement as to the ‚no doubt early' date of our ballad.

I must uphold the qualification ‚interesting' for this *brochure* notwithstanding Szamatolski's slashing criticism in the ‚Anzeiger' to vol. 36 of the Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum (p. 114 seq.q.) The result may be a long way behind what Tille imagined — if not *nil* as Szamatolski seems to think — but, negative as it is, it cannot prevent the investigation as such from being interesting from our point of view.

For any critical reader of the ballad in question [2]) must have felt that it has come down to us in a very much modified state, and that it is much later in date than Marlowe's play. And this is precisely what remains of Tille's investigations after deducting all that his critics can possibly object to. There can therefore be no question of Marlowe's having drawn upon this ballad for the motive of the Good and Evil Angel.

I may perhaps be allowed to add one word about the German Ballad. It had struck me already when reading this ballad for the first time that the words: (Engel no. 293 p. 293.)

[1]) A. Tille, Die Deutschen Volkslieder vom Doctor Faust, Halle 1890.

[2]) See this and related ballads on this subject *e. g.* in Tille's book and in C. Engel's Zusammenstellung der Faustschriften, No, 290 etc.

Doctor Faust, thu dich bekehren,
Weil du Zeit hast noch die Stund,
Gott will dir ja jetzt mittheilen
Die ew'ge wahre Huld, *etc.*

do not at all fit in the context where they are given either as those of the devil, which is out of the question, or as those of the poet, which there is no reason to think. They look more like the words of the ‚Engel von Gott gesandt' of whom it is said that as long as he was there ‚Wollt sich bekehren der Doctor Faust.' *i. e.* of the good Angel who comes in only afterwards so that we should have to assume here a case of transposition of lines. The words: „Häts das lieber bleiben lassen, Bei Gott findst du kein Pardon" sound so much like the utterances of the evil Angel in Marlowe's play [1]), and the whole situation — Faust being called upon to repent — reminds one so irresistibly of the scenes in Marlowe's play where the two Angels appear, that I cannot help thinking that in the original German Ballad the two Angels appeared and that we find only remnants of the evil angel's words in the Ballad as it has come down to us. Perhaps the part of the evil Angel became absorbed in course of time in that of the devil. Tille, after having given on p. p. 101, 102, part of a hypothetically reconstructed text adds; „Perhaps, as remarked before two more stanzas followed here in which Faust turns to the Angel and wishes to repent, when the Devil . . . gets him once more into his power etc. Here if we could accept Tille's hypothesis, the evil Angel may have found a place. But it may be as well to add that Szamatolski does not believe in Tille's reconstructions.

[1]) cf. *e.g.* l. 632 God cannot pity thee.
Is it necessary to add that I do not look for a resemblance in the words, but in the sentiments?

l. 103 (I, 74). Ioue.

See (besides Wagner's and Ward's note) the Time's Whistle (ed. Early English Text Society No. 48) l.l. 53 90, 112 etc.

l. 106 (I, 77)

Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please *etc.*

Düntzer (Anglia 1, 51) tells us that Marlowe's „severe dramatic style" does not allow of *tedious repetitions* (weitschweifigen Wiederholungen). If this be true we cannot avoid the conclusion that part of this speech cannot be Marlowe's. For, doubtless, there a r e some repetitions of theme, whatever we may think about their tediousness. But until the ‚severity' of Marlowe's style (in Düntzer's sense; his arguments should be read in the original) be proved, I cannot accept his conclusion.

l. 116 (I, 87). And make swift *Rhine* circle faire *Wertenberge.*

Wagner on p. 106 of his edition thinks that Marlowe may possibly have been told about the Rhine „by some of his actor-friends who had been in Germany", — and improving on this, suggests later on (Anglia II 312) that he may have been in Germany himself, and all this on account of the „most appropriate epithet of the Rhine": *swift.* Wagner who tells us himself that Chapman speaks of the Rhine as *cold,* swift-*running* forgets that this knowledge may have been common property. And we may ask if Marlowe would then have committed the blunder (see supra l. 13) to speak of *Wertenberg* here. Wittenberg (which is meant here) „is on the Elbe", says Prof. Ward[3] (p. 137); „but it seems idle to enquire whether Marlowe thought it lay on the Rhine". I am of opinion that it would not only be idle but also imprudent, as it would show that the enquirer did not see Marlowe's joke: Faus-

tus does not say that he finds the Rhine encircling Wittenberg (which would certainly show that Marlowe had not been in this place!) but that he will make ‚swift Rhine' do so. That is to be one of his conjuring tricks. We might as well (and as gravely) have been told that Germany is not known to have been „walled with brasse".

l. 120 seq. (I. 91 seq.).

And chase the Prince of Parma from our land
And raigne sole king of all our prouinces.

See on this passage, Van de Velde's German translation (1870) p. 28 s.s. and Engl. Studien 5,58 besides Ward pp. VII, LXVI, 138, 139; as well as the works quoted at those references. Notter's notion that this passage must have been inserted towards the close of 1597 is already in itself suspicious if we recall that it is supposed by Notter to be one of the ‚addycyons' of 1597, which we had better try to wipe out from our memory. There can be no doubt that this passage, if original, (and I find no reason to think that it is not) proves the play to have been written before some time in 1592 when Parma could not be ‚chased' from the Netherlands any more (referred to as *our* land as they then formed part of Germany) because Death had then performed what Faustus was so eager to do. But it is dangerous to go beyond this quasi-certainty, as Albers and Van de Velde have done; for, although it is certainly tempting to argue with them that if the play had been written after the summer of 1588 when the Spanish Armada was destroyed a reference to it would certainly have been found here, yet one wonders which reference could be expected in this passage which tells of wonderful things that Faustus wishes to see performed.

Ward incidentally remarks (p. 138[3]) that Alexander Farnese, *Prince* of Parma, became *Duke* of Parma in 1586. If we did not know for certain that Marlowe *could not* have written Dr. Faustus before that year, we may be sure that we should find some one quote this passage to prove that he did, as Farnese is here referred to as a Prince. We are therefore forced to conclude that Marlowe had either forgotten or did not know this circumstance and it may serve as a lesson to be prudent in „trying confusions", as Launcelot has it.

l.l. 130 seq. (I 102.)

Yet not your words onely, but mine own fantasie
That will receiue no object.

Ward is the only commentator who calls attention to a difficulty in this passage and not being able to solve it, concludes that it is ‚probably corrupt'. As it stands, he says, the meaning ‚seems to be . . . that will not receive anything offered from without' – whatever, I may add, this would apply to. By way of alternative we have the suggestion (*ib,*[3] p. 128) that this ‚obscure' passage may be explained by a reference to some *Disciplinae* which were called *objectivae* ‚because they treated *objecta intellectionis*, *res ipsas*'. I have to offer no opinion on the apriori likelihood of this suggestion, except that I do not see how it fits in with the context, but I fancy an easier solution may be arrived at. Faustus, I think, says that it is not only the words of his two friends that have driven him to deal in ‚Metaphysics of Magicians' but his own sweet will (fantasie) which will not brook any *objection*, which will receive no rebuff. There can be no difficulty in taking *object* = that which is objected, objection, as it is found in the sense of obstacle (Enc. Dict). Cf. moreover a modern usage such as Distance no object and think

of the now obsolete objectable as compared to modern objectionable; the verb to object, etc. If it be objected that Faustus could not expect any objection from Valdes and Cornelius, I beg to refer my objecting reader to l. 163 (I 133): therefore object it not. Van de Velde wrongly translates this: deshalb zweifle nicht.

l. 142 (I. 113) Swarme to my problems.

The editors do not comment on the word *problems*. It is translated by *thesis* (Verwey, Modderman) or by *Schlüsse* (= conclusions; Van de Velde). Neither translation would seem to be correct. For the context, I take it, does not require a ‚conclusion'; nor a ‚thesis', for „an enunciation of what one considers to be the truth, or what one pretends to be able to prove", which would fit in well enough, is not the same as a problem *i. e.* a matter put forward for examination or proof. All becomes clear if we remember that in l. 117 already Faustus has spoken of the Public Schools *i. e.* the (Wittenberg) University - buildings. So here, as in l. 117, there is a reference to Faustus' teaching of problems and it is more than likely that Marlowe had a passage in the F. B. in his mind where Faustus is spoken of as a Mathematician (Thoms p. 167) for then the Problems would be more especially appropriate.

l. 143 (I. 114). Musæus.

A curious misprint has crept into Prof. Ward's note on this line which, as it was allowed to stand in his second and third editions, and since it may puzzle others as it has puzzled me, it may be well to draw attention to. The right reading is of course:

Atque humeris exstantem suspicit altis for *suscipit!*

l. 145 (I, 116).
Whose shadowes made all *Europe* honor him (Agrippa).

Shadowes was altered by the 1616 Q (not by the 1609 one, as Dyce and Ward imply) into *shadow*, which reading Dyce accepted, probably because he did not understand that *shadowes* refers to the spirits (*i. e.* unreal beings) that Agrippa the Magician was supposed to have conjured up. For the use of *shadows* in this sense, cf. Schmidt Shakespeare-Lexicon *in voce* and *e. g.* our B-text l. 1287.

l. 150 (I, 120). So shall the subiects of euery element
(Be serviceable).

Subiects is by most Edd. abandoned for the reading of the B-text *spirits*. By some *subjects* is defended as being otherwhere used by Marlowe as *bodily form* or *body*, hence ,,bodily form taken by spirits" cf. Lear V, 3.60, *Sir, ... I hold you but a subject of this war"* where *subject* is, as Schmidt explains it, *one who ought to obey*. So in our line: ‚So shall (those who ought to obey, *i. e.* the servants) the familiar spirits of every element' etc. *i. e.* the line as in A expresses exactly the same as what is found in B. The *servile spirits* of l. 124 are referred to.

l. 153 (I 123). Like *Almaine* Rutters. . . . . .

Ward's reference to Tamburlaine is wrong owing to a misprint. The two lines are found in the second part, not the first. See l.l. 2339, 2375 of Wagner's edition.

l. 156 (I, 126). Shadowing more beautie in their ayrie brows.

Edd. do not comment on *ayrie* whose meaning is however not quite certain. Dr. Murray in the N. E. D. happens to quote it *in v.* sub 3 = ‚Placed high in the air, aerial, lofty, ethereal, heavenly' ,,which seems

to be the meaning in l. 820 (VII, 3). In l. 156 it may also belong sub 7: „Like air in its (apparently) intangible or empty character; unsubstantial, vain, empty unreal, imaginary". Imaginary would fit in very well, for the airy brows are those of the non-existent spirits. Like = *as*, as in l. 152.

l.l. 159 seq. (I. 129 seq.) And from *America* the golden fleece,
That yearly stuffes olde *Philip's* treasury.

„Notter has already called attention to the remark-„able contradiction between this line where ‚olde „Philip' is spoken of and a passage further on where „the German Emperor Charles the Fifth is represented „as being in the full possession of his powers" (Scene X). Thus Düntzer in the Anglia I, 54, who takes these lines as the nucleus round which others group themselves which are one and all to be rejected. He makes l. 161: ‚If learned Faustus will be resolute', follow l. 151.: ‚Be alwaies serviceable to us three', for all that intervenes (l.l. 152—160) is ‚somewhat stopgappy and just as suspicious' (etwas läppisch und ebenso auffallend). As the ‚contradiction' is undoubtedly the peg on which Düntzer has hung up his objections, all the *raison d'être* for assuming an interpolation will disappear if we can show that there is no such contradiction as Notter is supposed to have discovered.

First of all, o l d is not necessarily used with reference to Philip's age but „because his name was so familiar to English ears". (Ward p. 143) Considering however, that Philip was born in 1527 (Wagner p. 109) Marlowe might of course have used the epithet in its literal sense. But Charles the fifth is represented in the same play as a young vigorous man. („in voller Kraft") Supposing this to be true for the sake of argument (although it does not appear where Düntzer got

this from; he must have evolved it out of his inner consciousness) what would it prove? Assuredly not what Notter and Düntzer would make it out to mean: that he who had written the scene where the Emperor Charles is represented could not be the author of these lines. For the two episodes are not to be considered as on the same footing. If we had besides the reference to old Philip another reference say to young or middle aged Charles or if we had besides the scene where Faustus performs before the father another scene where he showed his art before the son, we might argue as Düntzer has done and, with at least some show of reason, come to his conclusion. But why could not Marlowe who follows the English F. B. (ch. XXIX) in bringing Dr. Faustus before ‚Carolus Quintus', — why could not Marlowe, writing himself in the year 1588 or 1589, allow himself a reference to his son? Of course strictly speaking, Marlowe would not have allowed it to escape him if he had remembered that in the mouth of Valdes and in the first scene of the play it is an anachronism, — the Emperor Charles occurs only in the tenth — but this only shows that Marlowe here as before (cf. note to l. 92) did not distinguish sufficiently between himself and his creations.

The *golden fleece* refers of course to the ‚plate--fleet' which the English and the Dutch were always after at that time, — see Ward, p. 143. Is it presuming too much upon the punning-propensities of the age to look for a play upon *fleece* and *fleets?* (Of course *stuffes* might be a plural as well as a singular). It is not in Ellis' investigation of Shakespeare's puns, (E. E. Pr. III, 920 seq.q.) nor in Dr. Wurth's hypercritical book. [1])

[1]) Das Wortspiel bei Shakespeare, Wien, Braumüller, 1895.

I find that Daniel assumes a similar play in the Merchant of Venice:

(Grat.) We are the *Jasons*, we have won the fleece.
(Sal.) I would you had won the *fleece* that hee (Ant.) hath lost (III, 2, 245).

See Daniel in Furness' Variorum ed. p. 162. Dr. Furness adds: „Qy. print *fleets* in..... Salerio's speech?"

In any case it is worth while drawing attention to this parallel.

ll. 184 seq. (I, 154 seq.) And whatsoever else is requisit
Wee will enforme thee.....

Both Wagner and Ward call the construction ‚loose' for ‚of whatsoever' etc. There is however nothing strange in it if we remember, that to inform means ‚to tell'. So: we will tell thee what is requisite. See, for the construction, Schmidt Shakespeare-Lex. *in voce* passim, and l. 228: „as this wine, if it could speake, it would enforme your worships". . . . . .

ll. 195 seq. (IInd Scene.)

This scene contains the conversation between Faustus and the two Scholars. It is said not to be Marlowe's by Delius in his doctoral dissertation: Marlowe's Faustus und seine Quelle (Bielefeld 1881). If Prof. Ward had not given undue prominence to this useless little book, by quoting it frequently with apparent admiration, nay by even calling it once ‚an essay of remarkable ability' (p. LXIX), I should not think it worth while to devote any time and space to a note on this work. That this judgment of Ward's should stand after Prof. Breymann's note on p. XXII of his edition and the review of Delius' paper which appeared in the ‚Literarisches Centralblatt' (Febr. 24 1883 col. 291, 292) is very remarkable, — if Prof. Ward had seen the expression of this opinion he would un-

doubtedly have found occasion to change his own. But the very fact that this has been overlooked makes it all but incumbent on me to refer to this worthless tract again and unfortunately at some length.

As the English prose version cannot have been used by Marlowe who wrote his play prior to 1592, before which time the English prose text cannot have appeared, Dr. Delius comes to the curious conclusion that all such passages as are founded on the English F. B. must be spurious! He goes so far as to admit one single line to be possibly Marlowe's, only because it has no equivalent in either G. F. B. or E. F. B. [1] A most extraordinary statement quite in contradiction with this hypothesis, is the one made on p. 20, where we read of some lines that „they must undoubtedly be ascribed to Marlowe, although it can *in casu* not be proved whether Marlowe used the E. F. B. or the G. F. B. for the lines in question"! so here it is deemed possible that Marlowe should have used the English text all the same. As may be expected, on Delius' hypotheses we get excisions wholesale! The scene with the old man is not Marlowe's, — the final scene is not his, the contract scene is not Marlowe's and the last Chorus is not. I have my doubts as to whether Dr. Delius has seen the English prose text at all, — he always quotes Dyce, and we find Thoms quoted only at second hand. The depth of the author's accuracy is gauged when we find him saying that the E. F. B. is „on the whole a close (genaue) translation of the G. F. B."!

Under the circumstances, it will not surprise any

[1]) cf. ib. p. 10, The line: Whose banks are set with groves of fruitful Vines, which is not found in either of the sources (sic!) may stand as one of Marlowe's. (mag noch von Marlowe selbst herrühren.)

one to hear that I must decline to enter into further arguments with our „able essayist" [1])

Wagner thinks it (p. 111 of his edition) „just possible (though far from proven) that this scene is not from Marlowe's pen but one of the additions of later poets." Let me be allowed to remark in passing how the commentators have the Henslowe-additions on the brain. This particular scene may be one „as the jokes against the Puritans were more common in the seventeenth century than in the sixteenth." The joke in question will be found in l. 224 (II, 26 cf. Ward p. 148). There is not much to argue against here, especially as Wagner is already half convinced that his view is not correct. I will only add that as the joke is found in the 1604 ed. which was licensed in January 1600—1601, it could hardly be anything but a 16th century one, even if it did not belong to the original text. But why should it not? See also *infra*, note to l. 224.

l. 199 (II 5). Sirra.

Better information than that quoted by Ward from Abbott (§ 478, not § 378 as W. has it) will be found in Skeat. Readers of Ant. and Cleopatra (V. 2, 229) will remember that Cleopatra uses it to Iras, her maid. Will it not be considered too much of a *parergon* if I add a note on this ‚feminine' use?

N. Delius in a note to the above passage from Shakespeare gives an interesting reference to Coles' Dictionary where it is rendered by *heus tu*, but I do not find it there in the first ed. 1676. Another instance is perhaps found in the Merchant of Venice I, 2, 146, where Portia may be supposed to address Nerissa in this way (instead of the servingman). See the *original*

[1]) See on the contrary Chapter II, § 3, for the one ‚redeeming feature' in Delius' paper.

punctuation. But see a sure case in S. Rowley's *When you see me you know me* (ed. 1607, Bodleian Library Copy, B 1, r°, where Will Somers says to Queen Jane: „how dost thou Iane, sirra."

l. 206 (II 12).
by force of argument that you being licenciate should stand upon 't.

Messrs. Wagner and Ward keep the reading of the Q_2 and Q_1 (respectively) explaining to stand upon = to insist upon. But I think there can be no doubt that *'t* must be omitted with Messrs. Dyce and Bullen.

That in *that you should stand* is a conjunction in Messrs. Wagner and Ward's idea, I suppose, but then we get as the meaning: It is not logically necessary that you should insist upon knowing where my master is, which (in the context) is nonsense. Omit *it* and take *that* as a pronoun = which (as in the B-text) and interpret: That of which I spoke (in l. 202) does not follow (by force of argument *i. e.)* logically, which (*viz.* which logical deductions) you, as you have taken your degree of licentiate, should insist upon *i. e.* you as licentiates should always make it a point to be logical in your speech. So, in l. 206, Wagner takes up the thread of his own words to the second scholar (l. 204) which have been interrupted by the first Scholar and he therefore repeats the words: that follows not. Perhaps we should place some dots behind ‚that followes not' in l. 202.

l. 212 (II, 17). Aske my fellow if I be a thiefe.

Modderman's translation (copied by Verwey) if perhaps too free, is excellent so far as the sense goes: Dat bewijst ook wat: gij lieden ligt onder één deken.

cf. The troublesome Raigne of King John, in Hazlitt's Shakespeare Library, part II, vol I p. 231. ‚This is right, aske my felow there if I be a thiefe.'

That Albers does not know what this means (Lemcke's Jahrbuch für Rom. and Engl. Phil. N. F. III 378) would not matter very much if he did not conclude from what he considers absence of meaning that the scene ‚seems to have been somewhat mutilated'!! This is the way in which some editors evolve mutilations out of their own ignorance.

l. 224 (II, 26). I will set my countenance like a precisian.

We read in Wagner (p. 111): ‚As the jokes against the Puritans were more common in the seventeenth century – I suppose Wagner refers to the numerous allusions to the Puritans in Ben Jonson's comedies – ‚than in the sixteenth, it is just possible (though far from proven) that this scene is not from Marlowe's pen, but one of the additions of later poets.' (See *supra* p. 27.) That this assumption is not correct will also be apparent from the references to contemporary authors (where the Puritans are made fun of, or at any rate condemned) collected by Ward (p. 149) and by Vatke in the Shakespeare Jahrbuch vol 21, p.p. 240 seq.q. Some additional passages (16th and 17th century ones) may be welcome:

> Shee's holy, wise and too precise for me
> Greene's James IV. II, 2, 158 (Manly Presh. Dr. II, 366)
> whereas the Puritan is a man of upright calfe, and clean nosthrill. Daborne's Christ. Turn'd Turk l. 495 (Anglia 20, 205)

and it is difficult to believe that Shakespeare did not think of the Puritans when he wrote:

> So may the outward showes be least themselues
> The world is still deceiu'd with ornament . . .
> . . . . . In Religion
> What damned error, but some sober brow
> Will bless it, and approue it with a text, *etc.*
> Merch. of Venice III, 2, 73 s.s. [1])

[1]) See Fleay: *Shakespeare and Puritanism*, Anglia 7, 223 where this passage is not mentioned.

We have besides two vehement sallies against them in the Times Whistle (*c.* 1615); the one beginning

> You hypocriticall precisians,
> By vulgar phrase entitled Puritanes, –

and the other:

> Fine Mistris Simula, the Puritane,
> Which as the plague shunnes all that are profane, *etc.*

in which they are charged with every sort of villany: they are soule-seducers, „seeming saints and yet incarnat devils", slanderers, scoffers, and are accused of lust and ‚damnd hypocrisie'. ‚In the mean time you may be forced to dwell At Amsterdam, or else sent quicke to hell'. See The Times' Whistle ed. J. M. Cowper. E. E. T. S. n° 48 p. p. 10 and 26. –

In a poem (in the same volume) called Somnium, True Religion is made to say:

> There is a sort of purest seeming men
> That aide this monster (hypocrisie) in her wrongful cause,
> Those the world nameth – Puritans I meane –
> Sent to supplant me *etc. etc.* cf. ib. p. 141

and see also another called Christianus Agnus ib. p. 143 l. 23 s.s.

An interesting skit on the Puritans is found in *A Pleasant conceited Comedie, wherein is shewed how a man may chose a good wife from a bad*, printed 1602 (Dodsley-Hazlitt vol. IX p. p. 1–96) which according to Swaen (Tijdschrift voor Ned. Taal en Letterk. vol. XVI p. 122, 128) was imitated bij Starter in his ‚Menniste Vrijagie'.

And lastly in the B text of our play we have (Breymann p. 129) Benvolio (*i. e.* the Knight of the A-text) saying:

> „And Schollers be such Cuckold-makers to clap hornes of (= on) honest mens heades o' this order, I' le nere trust smooth faces, and small *ruffes* more.

The small ruffs were worn by Precisians (inclusive of Scholars) whereas double ruffs were characteristic of the worldlily inclined. See Shakespeare Jahrbuch 21, 244; Nares *in v. v.* ruff and ruffband and Swaen *u. s.* p. 124, (l. 6.) See *infra* note to l. 738. Stubbes' Anatomie of Abuses ed. Furnivall p. 52, 70, 243, 258.

ll. 231, 232 (II, 32, 33.)

that damned art, for which they two are infamous through the world.

Dr. Kellner proposes *famous* for *infamous*. (E. Stud. 14, 139). Although a man may be *famous* for an art, there can be no objection surely to calling any one *infamous* for what must be qualified as a damned art.

cf. Since so many . . . . . rumoring tales have been spread, of the fame, or rather indeed infamie . . . . . of this . . . . . pirate Ward . . . . .

which is quoted from a pamphlet (1609) on the famous (or rather infamous) captains Ward and Danseker *(sign.* A. 3. r°. See for the full title and particulars: Anglia 20, 177) and also *supra* n. to ll. 7 seq.

l. 248 (III 9). Forward and backward anagrammatis'd.

It will be noticed that to *anagrammatize* which is given in the N. E. D. as being said of a transposition of letters *so as to form another word* (cf. Eva, Ave, Vae) is here used in the extended sense of to transpose letters, or even to write (in a different order), otherwise *forward and backward* would have no meaning. cf.: I work by no false arts, medicines, or charms, To be said forward and backward, The Devil is an ass. I 3, ed. Cunningham II 223.

l. 257 (III, 16). Belsibub.

In the corresponding passage of the English F. B. (Thoms III 168, 170) Belzebub is mentioned but not

in the G. F. B. (nor in the Wolfenbüttel-text; *cf. Historia D. Johannis Fausti des Zauberers* von Gustav Milchsack. I. Wolfenbüttel, Zwissler, 1892—1897, a book which notwithstanding far too much irrelevant and irritating matter should be studied by every Faustus- and Faust-student, on account of the author's interesting hypothesis concerning the origin of the German Volksbuch.

l. 259 (III, 20). quod tumeraris.

Three scholars seem to have independently thought of the very ingenious emendation *quid tu moraris*, *viz.* Bullen and Fleay (cf. apud Bullen I 224), and K. J. Schröer, — see Anglia V 135. Schröer being on the look-out for a formula in conjuring books which might contain the passage in which *quod tumeraris* occurs, hit upon: Cito, cito, cito veni nec morare velis, which he quotes from Scheible's Kloster V, 1157. There is no doubt that this is a very interesting parallel, but that it should be a possible original I doubt, considering that Marlowe must have read in his source: „Faustus, vexed at his spirits so long *tarrying*, used his charms", — see the full context in Thoms III, 170. — The throwing of the water was not an essential part of the charm. It did not always work at once and when it was not effective the charm had to be repeated or (and we have a case in point here) an other one was tried.

See a drawing in Scheible's Kloster V opposite p. 1131, and the r° of the fifth page of drawings (from the end) after p.p. 1160 seq.q. See a Citatio Mephistopheles *ib.* p. 1129 seq. The saying of Bodin „it is a principle of magic for unintelligible words to have more force than intelligible" quoted by Ward to explain *quod tumeraris* is quite true, but it is not applicable here. It could

explain only passages which are entirely unintelligible such as the charm *Blaerde Shay Alphenio Kasbue Gorfons Alsbuifrio* by which Reynard is to overcome the Wolf. (Reynard the Fox ed. Arber p. 104) cf. *e.g.* Scheible's Kloster V p.p. 1148, 1149, 1151, etc. etc. *infra* l. 1005.

l. 265. (III. 25). Franciscan Friar.

See on the Franciscan Friar an interesting article in the Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte und Renaissance Literatur 1887 p. 174 (Ellinger).

l. 266. (III, 26). That holy shape becomes a diuell best.

I must draw attention to a most curious utterance of Ward's in connection with this line. „This is a sentiment' he says ‚which need not be ascribed to Marlowe himself" (p. 153). Surely, this is going a little too far. There is a sentiment of which Ward is himself the first to allow the possibility that it should be Marlowe's, for he continues „although both in our play, VII 52 and elsewhere ... he gladly seizes an opportunity for a stroke against the monks." For all that, Ward insinuates that the passage is inserted. And how does he do that? By saying that it need not be ascribed to Marlowe, thereby laying the burden of proof that it is his on the shoulders of those who find it in the text and see no reason to think that it is not. It would of course be Prof. Ward's duty to give his reasons why it should nót be, if he thinks it is not.

I should not like to be unjust to Prof. Ward. This would, I think, be the case if I did not add here what seems to me to be the excuse for this seemingly essentially unscientific procedure. It is found in the fact that commentators have been continually brought

face to face with the supposed ‚additions' of 1597. As long as those could be — I should say: had to be — believed in, it is excusable that a critic should think it proven that the 1604 text contained additions, and that he should hence be on the look-out for them. But since the notice regarding the 1597 additions has been proved to be a forgery, speculations regarding them should have ceased long ago. Now all this talk about these ‚additions' engenders the idea that it becomes rather a remarkable thing that any passage should really be left as Marlowe's and hence the statement that a sentiment ‚need not be' ascribed to Marlowe. See *infra* (Chapter II) on these additions.

l. 286. (III 46). That was the cause but yet per accident.

The expression *per accident* has been altered by all Edd., it would seem to me quite unnecessarily, to *per accidens*. Just as in l. 544 we have the Englishing of *per praesentes* (which expression *by these presents* is retained in legal documents to the present day), so it would be difficult to sustain that *per accidens* could not be found Englished. And hence I dare not change it in the face of the concurrence of Quarto's $A^{1.2.}$ and $B^{1-3.}$ Note that the French *par accident* may have influenced the *t*-form too, see the N. E. D. *in voce*.

It is important to mention that this line (and its context) showing that after all Dr. Faustus' conjuring in itself was of no avail to him is neither in the G. F. B. nor in the E. F. B. so that this was added by Marlowe.

ll. 292 seq. (III. 52, seq.)

Therefore the shortest cut for coniuring
Is stoutly to abiure the Trinitie.

When we find the second line in the B-text changed to: Is stoutly to abiure all godlinesse, we are at once

reminded of James' I „Act to restrain the Abuses of Players" (3 Jac. I. c. 21 — cf. Statutes at Large, 1. Jac. I — 10 Will. III vol. III p. 60, ed. 1786) whereby it is enacted: That if at any Time or Times after the end of this present Session of Parliament any Person or Persons do or shall in any stage-play, Enterlude, Shew May-game or Pageant, jestingly or profanely speak or use the holy Name of God or of Christ Jesus, or of the Holy Ghost, or of the Trinity, which are not to be spoken but with Fear and Reverence, shall forfeit for every such offence Ten Pounds'. And if then we find similar substitutions, such as *power* for *God* all over the play (B-text) we necessarily come to the conclusion that this text has been tampered with by one who looked upon these expressions as offensive. The following table will therefore be of interest. It was compiled on the assumption that the changes might be supposed to have been carried out consistently, — this assumption will however prove erroneous. In the first column will be found the words and expressions of the A-text which as they would seem to be ‚offensive', must be expected to have been changed in the B-texts. In the second column 1° those which we expect to find unaltered in the B-text as they contain no ‚oaths' but only ‚asseverations' and 2° those which constitute a mere ‚mention'. (See *infra*). As the light of King James' ‚casuistry' was not available I found the sifting-process not a very easy one to carry out. Besides the act quoted, we have some passages in Herbert's (the Master of the Revels) office-book to guide us, from which it appears ‚that the King at times took on himself the duties of the Master of the Revels; reformed plays and marked passages to be expunged; ... investigated offences of the players; and decided the subtle casuistical problem of the boundary line between oaths and

asseverations.'[1]) I may add that there was no reason to make the second column exhaustive.

I		II	
A-text l.	B-text l.	A-text l.	B-text l.
		99 *Gods heauy wrath.*	96 *Gods heauy wrath.*
		200 *God ... knows.*	192 *God knowes.*
		[This has been put in this col. in the supposition that it is a mention merely, and not used ‚profanely', but I am not sure that it may not have to be looked upon as being used ‚jestingly', in which case it should go into col. I. and form an exception as it is not changed in the B-text.]	
		287 *God.*	274 *God.*
293 *Trinitie*	280 *godlinesse.*		
		306 *God.*	293 *God.*
439 *God forgive me.*	399 omitted.		
		443 *God or heauen.*	420 *God or Heauen.*
450 *To God?*	408 omitted.		

[Notice however that in many cases, such as in l.l. 448, 449, the same expression is found as well as in the corresponding

[1]) Fleay, *A Chron. History of the London Stage* p. 313. Mr. Fleay goes on to say: „It is to this Royal intellect that we owe the dictum that ‚slight' is no oath, while ‚God's light' is one; that ‚death' is an asseveration and therefore pardonable, but 's death' is not." Some of us may think that they could improve upon this Royal proceeding but for all that the ‚subtle casuistry' involved may serve as an excuse for those who like myself are afraid to have been unsuccessful; cf. Fleay, *i.b.* p. p. 337, 338.

This casuistry is happily hit off by Jonson in his Alchemist (I, 1), — *I' fac's no oath;* see the context *e. g.* Gifford-Cunningham, II p. 14: cf. *infra* note to l. 738.

I.		II.	
A-text l.	B-text l.	A-text l.	B-text l.

lines in the B-texts. If, as is very likely, the omission under consideration is therefore accidental, the case, if noticed at all, should be mentioned in the opposite column.]

465 *What God.*	423 *What power.*
518 (flie) *unto God.*	476 (flye) *unto heauen.*

[Dyce substituted *God*, in accordance with the A-text, for *heauen* of the B-texts and he has been followed by other commentators even by Breymann. The present investigation will be sufficient to show, without further commentary that this is inadmissible.]

705 *Ah Christ.*	644 *O Christ*
707 *Christ cannot* etc.	646 *Christ cannot.*

[These two cases seem to me not to fall under the head of oaths but to be merely mentions. For it seems scarcely possible even in the spirit of King James, to interpret the words of the Act concerning ‚Christ' by saying that ‚Christ Jesus' is not allowed and ‚Christ' by itself is.]

1338 *'s bloud.*

[No equivalent of this scene in the A-text. I put it under this head as it does not seem to me to be an oath; but cf. Fleay *l.c.* p. p. 313 and 337, 338 from which it will be seen that the case

I.		II.	
A-text l.	B-text l.	A-text l.	B-text l.
			is doubtful. If it be one, we should not expect it in the B-text. The same may be said of *Zounds* l. 1429, 1483, of *marry*, l. 1572 etc. except that they are very much less doubtful.]
			B 1430 *for Gods sake.* [One would expect this to partake of the nature of an oath and consequently not to be found in the B-text.]
	1477 *Defend me heauen.* [This scene is missing in A. Had it been there, we might have found: Defend me God, *a. s. quid.*]		
1145 *God saue you,*	1497 omitted.		
		1472 *to God*	2015 *to heauen*
		1477 *where God stretcheth out his Arme.*	2020 omitted
		1480 *wrath of God*	2023 *of heauen.*
		1493 *Oh God!*	2034 omitted
		1515 *My God, my God*	2055 *O mercy, heauen.*
			2064 *O help vs heauen.*
			[There would not seem to be any reason in any of these last five cases for changing or omitting the readings of the A-text, but it is difficult in the teeth of the combined evidence not to accept it as a fact that the frequent mention of God seemed profane to the author or reviser of the B-text. If so, these cases should go into the first column.]

The preceding lists were compiled under the impression that they might shed some light on the vexed question of the additions in the B-text. If the result had been as anticipated by me when I went into the matter, that such parts of the A-text as are admitted on all hands to be Marlowian (written long before the Act in question was promulgated) allowed all such expressions to stand, and that on the contrary, say such an ‚addycyon' as the Bruno-scenes (which no one has ever claimed for Marlowe) presented no offensive expressions at all, — if such were the case, we should have found an excellent criterion in the absence or presence of such expressions in other scenes in the B-text to help us to determine whether or no they formed part of the original text.

But our texts have been too much tampered with to allow us to come to any such conclusion. There can be no doubt that Marlowe's text, as it originally stood, must have contained objectionable expressions. It is evident on the other hand that the compiler or the reviser of the B-text has taken great pains to eliminate all such words as could in any way give offence. And as the authors of this revised text, at least of the additions, are supposed to have been Messrs. Birde and Rowley, who may be taken to have worked at ‚Dr. Faustus' about Nov. 1602, we are apt, seeing that the act dates from 1606, to come to the conclusion that they cannot be responsible for this purifying process, and that consequently the B-text as constituted in 1602, must have been revised [1]) between 1606 and 1616 when it was printed as we know it

[1]) This might have been after Sept. 13, 1610 — cf. Fleay in the Appendix A. to Ward's Introduction, although it is not unimaginable that Bushell should have printed a text of the B-type, say in 1609 or 1610 before the copyright was transferred.

now. This would be a very interesting conclusion. One thing is quite certain *viz.*, that what we know of Samuel Rowley's writings — we do not know anything of Bird's — does not preclude the possibility of his having used offensive expressions. But we must not feel too sure of this. [1]) Nor must we lose sight of the fact that, as the C. P. ed. of Julius Caesar points out, „although no actual legislation had taken place so early as 1600, it cannot be doubted that this Act of Parliament was only the culmination of a strong feeling in the minds of a large and influential class against the profanity which was believed to be encouraged by the stage". (Pref. p. VIII). The question as to whether Rowley or a subsequent writer is responsible for the absence of profane expressions must therefore remain an open one. It is more remarkable that even the first Quarto contains so very few. This also I would attribute to that strong feeling of which we read *supra* that it existed long before the King's legislation on the subject.

If I am right in this conclusion, it becomes clear that the A-text has also been ‚tampered with'. This view is of course perfectly consistent with the one that we have no evidence of any ‚addition' having been made to the A-text. (See Chapter II § 1.)

It must have ‚been originated' before November 1589 says Zarnke, Anglia 9, 611. „For at this time the acting of the company for which it was written was interrupted,

[1]) The only extant play that can be with certainty assigned to Rowley is entitled ‚When you see me you know me' (Dict. of Nat. Biogr. *in voce*). In the first ed. of this play, 1605, — it will be observed that although before 3 Jac. I, it may be considered under the influence of the ‚strong feeling' already referred to — I have found none of the expressions mentioned in the official document, but the oath ‚Mother of God' is used there *passim* in a manner which must assuredly have seemed offensive to many a contemporary.

and the allusions on the condition of the Netherlands contained in it do not admit of a later date." If the ‚generally received view' (Ward p. VIII) is correct, that Greene wrote his Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay ‚at' Marlowe's Dr. Faustus, and if Fleay is right in assigning the former play to some time shortly before July 25th, 1589, we must necessarily conclude that Marlowe's play was anterior to that date too. There is more. The ballad was licensed in February 1589 (N. S.) and as the ballad presupposes the play — see on the ballad below, ch. II, § 3 — it is more than probable that the play was written at the latest early in 1589. (N. S.)

As to the text being ‚tampered' with, this may have taken place about 1600. It could not very well be long before — which would take us too far away from the date of the King's interference, and it is not likely to have been later than the 7th of January 1601 (N. S.) since this is the date when the text, which was issued in 1604, was entered into the Registers of the Stationers' Company.

l.l. 316 seq. (III, 76, seq.)

Faust „How comes it then that thou art out of hel?
Meph. Why this is hel, nor am I out of it, *etc. etc.*

It has often been contended that Marlowe was an atheist. It may be so. Personally I am inclined to think that too much of this idea is based on the Atheist's tragedy, which idea persists although Mr. Bullen has shaken our belief in the authenticity of this ballad (Bullen I p. XIV). It seems difficult however not to accept the contemporary evidence which proclaims him at least a freethinker, (see the latest on this head in the Athenæum Aug. 18, 1894, p. 235, seq.) even allowing for all the ‚exaggerations' of an enemy that Mr. Bullen has pleaded (Academy, May,

16, 1896, p. 411). But that Marlowe's atheism should appear from his *Dr. Faustus* seems to me so very extraordinary a notion that it may be well worth while to protest against it, *apropos* of one of the many passages from which the contrary should at once manifest itself. It is astonishing to read in the late Mr. Symonds' *Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama* „that the whole handling by Marlowe of the Faust legend inclines one rather to believe that, if it is in any true sense autobiographical, the poet was but an ill-contented and heart-sick atheist."

Would an atheist have made the servant of Lucifer regret the time when he „saw the face of God And tasted the eternal ioyes of heauen", and could an atheist have created — I think I am justified in using the word — that most impressive wavering between Good and Evil which is depicted by the introduction of the Good and Evil Angels? And would it be possible for an atheist to have written this most imposing of death scenes? I, for one, know that it struck a chord in usually very insensible hearts when — in June 1896, — Marlowe's play was acted by the Elizabethan Stage-society.

l.l. 356 seq.q. (scene IV).

The whole of this scene has been made out to be ‚a later addition' just like the one which, with considerable variations, takes its place in the B-text. With the latter we have no concern; with regard to the former it will be best to go through it and examine one by one the arguments that have been brought to bear against it.

Wagner points to a passage in the Taming of a Shrew which is very similar to the one under consideration (p. 114) and thinks that he „need but point

out this curious coincidence to show that such stale jests..... belonged to the stock requisites of the acting companies". Indeed? We may begin by asking how, if these are *stale jests* and *stock requisites of the companies*, — how the coincidence between the two plays could then be looked upon as ‚curious'. But this may be a slip. And why should they be ‚stock requisites'? Because Dr. Wagner found them in *two* plays. To this conclusion and the words he follows this up with, *viz.* that they were „probably improvised by the actors whenever they thought fit", he might have a right if similar scenes were found in very many plays [1]) although even then the objection would hold that, if they were ‚improvised' we should not expect so much similarity! — but surely the conclusion is here in any case built on too slender foundations. This will become clearer still if we establish the relation in which the two plays stand to each other, as we shall then see that the two testimonies are not even independent of each other!

For what *is* the relation of the Taming of a Shrew to Dr. Faustus? Many critics from Dyce down to the latest editor of this play [2]) have pointed to a good many passages which ‚correspond' — to borrow Ward's safe expression p. LXIV note 2, — to some in Marlowe's Dr. Faust, but these ‚correspondences' have led the different critics concerned to almost as many different conclusions. According to some, these coincidences in form point to Marlowe as the author or at least the joint-author of that play [3]); others suggest that

[1]) Cf. infra p. 47 note 1.

[2]) Cf. Old English Plays, The Taming of a Shrew ed. Hopkinson. London, Sims and Co. 1895.

[3]) cf. Professor Brown in Grosart's Introduction to his edition of Greene's Works (Huth Library) vol I p. XV who suggests as an alternative that if it was not Marlowe, it must have been „an audacious plagiarist of Marlowe"; and see Hopkinson l. c. p. VII: „Marlowe's hand may be traced in this play".

they were imitated from the Taming of a shrew [1]). Fleay on the other hand suggests that „it is highly improbable that the copying should have been on the side of Faustus."

That Marlowe cannot be supposed to have been the author (or joint-author) of the Taming of a shrew will appear presently, and we shall also find that there can be no doubt that Mr. Fleay is right in assuming the borrowing not to have been on the side of Faustus. When we read through ‚A shrew', we cannot help being struck by the large number of lines and expressions which all and one occur in Dr. Faustus, or remind one irresistibly of Marlowe's manner. I shall here quote the text of ‚A shrew' from an edition which I may suppose to be accessible to all students of the subject, — Mr. Morley's reprint in Cassell's Nat. Libr. vol. 144. To save space, I only refer to the corresponding lines in Dr. Faustus.

Morley. Dr. Faustus.

I. p. 145.

Now that the gloomie shadow of the night,
Longing to view Orions drisling lookes, *etc.* cf l. 240 seq.q.

II. p. 148. Shoulder of mutton l. 365

III. ib.

Ile fetch you lustie steedes more swift of pace
Then winged Pegasus in all his pride
That ran so swiftlie over the Persian plaines.

This line seems me to be very much like parodying Marlowe.

IV. p. 152.

O might I see the center of my soule
Whose sacred beautie hath inchanted me,
More faire then was the Grecian Helena
For whose sweet sake so many princes dide,
That came with thousand shippes to Tenedos.

cf. the two appearances of Helena in l.l. 1297 and 1363.

V. p. 156. Enter Polidors Boie, *etc.*

[1]) See *e. g.* Ward p. LXIV.

The whole of this scene as well as the one on p. 165 is quite alike in tone to our scene IV, see the remarks at the commencement of this note. Notice that the jest on Catapie – Cake and Pie is of exactly the same character as the guilders and gridirons in Dr. Faustus.

VI. p. 157. Ecce signum — Dr. F. l. 979

VII. ib. orient pearle — l. 110
cf. p. 159 pretious firie pointed stones of Indie, and cf. pp. 162, 163.

VIII. p. 166. Ile cut off one of thy legges.
cf. ib. Holde thee there's
Two shillings for thee to pay for the Healing of thy left legge .... etc.....
Here here take your two shillings [again.
— cf. l. 1214 for the leg-episode and l. 400 for the rendering of money.

IX. p. 171. the heauen cristalline
cf. p. 145 Christall heavens; cf. lady .... Christalline p. 181; chrystall sky p. 191. — cf. B-text l. 620

X. p. 178.
Should thou assay to scale the seate of Ioue,
Mounting the suttle ayrie regions
Or be snatcht up as erste was Ganimed
Loue should give winges vnto my swift desires
And prune my thoughts that I would follow thee
Or fall and perish as did Icarus. — cf. l.l. 20–22

XI. p. 184.
And hewd thee smaller than the Libian sandes. — B-text l. 1436

XII. ib. toplesse Alpes. — cf. l. 1364

If any one of these twelve cases occurred by itself, no weight would attach to it, but no one will consider their aggregate weight despicable. It is of course perfectly true that such words as *toplesse, orient pearle*, etc. occur often enough outside Marlowe's works but the prominent places given to these expressions seem to point to the fact that there is imitation at work. And if

then we hear that The taming of a shrew „abounds in imitations or plagiarisms from *plays* (I italicise on account of the plural form) recently produced by the Admiral's men" so much so that it was „distinctly satirised on that account by Nash and Green" in 1589 (Fleay *apud* Ward[3] p. CXLII) we are quite disposed to believe *à priori* that Marlowe's Dr. Faustus was one of them. This view would seem to be born out by the following considerations. Whatever we may think of some of the cases quoted in particular, it is hard not to believe in their solidarity. If therefore the consideration of one of these cases leads us to a conclusion, which strictly can be looked upon as established only in that one case, we may be allowed to consider the other cases to point in the same direction (of imitation) unless positive proof to the contrary were forthcoming.

The indication foreshadowed in what I have just said, I have found, I think, in the first passage quoted.

No one to my knowledge has ever doubted l.l. 240 of our play to be in Marlowe's vein:

> Now that the gloomy shadow of the earth
> Longing to view Orions drisling looke
> Leapes from th'antartike world vnto the skie,
> And dimmes the welkin with her pitchy breath....

are certainly worthy to be quoted as specimens of Marlowe's ‚mighty line.' And these lines with the slightly bathetic fall to the next line:

> Faustus, begin thine incantations,

could they be more happily hit off than by the words of the Lord in the Taming of A shrew:?

> Now that the gloomie shaddow of the night,
> Longing to view Orions drisling lookes,
> Leapes from th'antarticke world vnto the skie,
> And dims the Welkin with her pitchie breath,
> And darkesome night oreshades the christall heauens,

Here breake we off our hunting for to night,
Cupple vppe the hounds *etc.*

This sudden turn *Here breake we off* seems to me exquisite and in my mind's eye I see the author laughing in his sleeve when he wrote it, and I fancy I hear the groundlings' roar of applause that must have followed these words. And the author seems to have been so much in love with this turn that we get a very similar one at the end of the play when the Tapster gives us an other bit of similar bombast:

„Now that the darksome night is overpast,
„And dawning day appeares in chrystall sky,
„Now must I hast abroad." p. 191.

I cannot help thinking that the Taming of a shrew — whatever its relations to other plays may be, that Fleay is thinking of [1]) — is to be considered throughout as being a skit on Dr. Faustus, at least as being full of reminiscences of this play. It will now be seen why I said, above, that we cannot possibly look upon Marlowe as the author or joint-author of the Taming of a shrew. We can hardly suppose him to have made fun of his own work.

To return now to our original investigation, — as we find the passage under consideration (l. l. 356 seqq.) to be imitated *from* the only other play in which similar passages are found, very little remains of Dr. Wagner's hypothesis concerning the ‚Stock-requisites'. We need therefore not yet subscribe to his statement that ‚Marlowe is no doubt innocent of them'.

In connection with this question it may be well to

[1]) As he does not mention any I cannot investigate the matter further. One would think of Greene's James IV as one, — cf. Manly's Preshaksperean Drama II, 381 (Chorus to the 3d Act.) with the Taming of a shrew, Morley p.p. 156, 165 — but for the fact that it is attributed by Ward (H. E. Dr. L. I. 220) to ab. 1592. I cannot now investigate whether this date is correct.

refer to a statement of Wagner's, repeated by Ward, that this scene ‚corresponds to the scenes in the German popular play in which *Hans Wurst* is engaged by Wagner.' Ward ‚particularises and quotes ‚scene 5 of Das Volks-Schauspiel Doctor Johann Faust in Engels ‚edition'. If it occurs only in Engel's text (which I cannot now verify) we must be very careful, for this text has been shown by Bruinier [1]) to be a falsification.

But even speaking in a general way, I am of opinion that this statement — although it is given a very prominent place in Wagner's note — cannot have any bearing on the question in hand. For these correspondences are sufficiently explained by the fact that these German puppet plays derive from Marlowe's Faust.

Some other arguments tending to prove this scene to be interpolated were advanced by Albers (*l. l.* cf. note to l. 212) p. 379. His first argument is to the effect that Wagner „did not know anything about his masters conjuration" (sic) and that he could at any rate not „conjure any devil before his master himself had entered into connection with Lucifer" (sic) and Albers continues: „Such a blunder against plain logic and the first principles of dramatic art I cannot impute to Marlowe". This discussion would at the very most prove that this scene was not in its original place. Moreover his argument—reasoning as he does from the point of view of strict logic — would hold for a 19th century author rather than for a 16th century one. In any case, whatever weight his objection may carry, it applies to the person who is the author of our scene (according to Albers' assumption) with just as much force as to Marlowe. What does Albers know

[1]) Bruinier, Das Engel'sche Volkschauspiel als eine Fälschung nachgewiesen (Faust vor Goethe I) Halle, Niemeyer, 1895.

about Marlowe to justify him in saying Marlowe could not commit such a blunder?

I must moreover add — if after the preceding aprioristical considerations it is worth while doing so — that Albers' premises are by no means safe! Whence does it appear that Wagner did not and could not know anything about the conjuring tricks? From scenes VIII and IX (especially the latter) it appears that the mere possession of Faustus' conjuring books (cf. A l. 940 and B l. 749) is sufficient for the purpose, so why could not Wagner have ‚borrowed' these useful instruments which had been given to his master before? Nay, Faustus himself has the power to make Mephistophiles appear by his ‚charms'. See A l. l. 147 and 244 seq.q.

Albers' second argument — upon which he lays great stress — is that the passage concerning *french crownes* (l. 394) must have been added later on, probably about 1597.

„In the year 1595 an active and considerable commerce arose between England and France. England commenced to export a large quantity „d'objets de première nécessité" to France and this commerce together with the reimbursement of the large sums which Queen Elizabeth had lent to Henry IV, drew a large quantity of French money to England; but this was not the case in the days of Marlowe, and the allusion in his days would have been rather incomprehensible. Five years later — in 1602 — when Birde and Rowley revised the play, Sully had already improved the French finances so much that the allusion was omitted as antiquated."

Such are Dr. Albers' additional reasons for rejecting this passage and consequently the scene. The logic of this ‚consequently' may not be quite apparent

to my readers, — let us accept it for the sake of argument. Students of political economy will have to controll the statements of fact contained in the passage quoted; we shall assume it to be quite correct, — again for the sake of argument.

Under those circumstances it would seem impossible to shake Albers' conclusion which I have spaced that *the allusion* in Marlowe's day would seem to be rather incomprehensible. Yes, but *which* conclusion? Albers interprets this passage to contain an allusion to the small value of french crowns. But let anyone read over the passage carefully and he cannot but come to the conclusion that what Albers says is „perfectly true, except that it is just the contrary." I must refer to my note on l. 394, where it will be found shown that, in the opinion of the writer of the line under consideration, French crowns were greatly valued, or at least very well known. So Albers' carefully concocted argument, whatever may be its value from the point of view of history, falls to the ground.

l. 358. (IV 3). pickadeuaunts.

The same word occurs in the corresponding scene (cf. ante note to l. 356) of the Taming of a shrew (ed. Morley, p. 165), and under the slightly disguised form *pickenovant,* in the Second report of Dr. Faustus (Thoms E. E. Pr. Romances, III p. 382). Such a *pickedevaunt* may be seen in the drawing of the Swan-theatre (in Gaedertz' *zur Kentniss der Altenglischen Bühne,* 1888) in which I seem to recognise Malvolio (see Anglia 19,117 seq.q.)

ll. 360 seq. (IV 4, seq.)

Tel me sirra, hast thou any commings in?
I, and goings out, you may see else.

As Edd. do not comment on this passage and as the

various translations given do not point to a right understanding on the part of the translators, it may be desirable to add a note. Comming in is of course = income; cf. N. E. D. II p. 665 and: he lives upon his *commings in*, Anglia 20, 207 (Daborne's A Christian Turn'd Turke l. 546) but goings out is not and expenses too (Und ausgaben dazu) as Van de Velde translates, but it refers to his arms „going out" of his sleeves *i. e.* he is out at elbows. cf. l. 363: The vilaine is bare.

For *else* = if you do not believe it, cf. Green's I am Orgalio, Ask all the people else (N. E. D. *i.v.* sub 4 c.) and Daborne, *u. s.* l. 2008: look on his beard *else*, and: I take but two handfulls of his wine, and it shall fill foure hoggesheads of thine (look here else). Rowley, *When you see me you know me", sign.* K. 2 r°.

l. 372. (IV, 15.) Qui mihi discipulus.

Ward sides with Müller in thinking that these words „may be supposed to be scanned by Wagner's hand on the clown's back". It is only the consideration that there would then be more sense in *beaten-silk* and *stauesacre* which inclines one to accept the suggestion. But should we not expect a cry or an imprecation on the part of the clown if he had been beaten, instead of the words „How in Verse?" Moreover is it not *infra dignitate* for Wagner, the serious pedant, to beat the clown? Wagner is constantly quoting latin (cf. l. 438 seq.) and the clown, of course not understanding it, concludes it must be verse. See however the note to l. 374.

l. 374. (IV, 17.) No sirra, in beaten silke and stauesacre.

The context seems to require a joke, a pun behind *beaten silk* and *stauesacre*, although the latter is the

only word for which the clown catches Wagner up. With reference to the note on l. 372, I may therefore ask: so Wagner is not so dryasdustic after all?

With regard to *beaten silk*, — according to the N. E. D. *in voce* sub. 5. c. (p. 742) it means merely *embroidered*, whereas the note on p. 160 of Ward's edition makes me think that according to Prof. Ward's authority, the meaning must be a technical one.

beaten velvet and *beaten sarcenet* are quoted in the N. E. D.; *beaten satin* is quoted by Ward from Decker; it also occurs in Jonson's Staple of News, Induction, ed. Cunningham II p. 276.

l. 375. (IV, 18). How, how, knaues-acre! I, I thought that was al the land his father left him.

I have no doubt that the word *knavesacre* is not used here in reference to a London Street, (cf. apud Ward) but that it must be taken literally: Ah, — the Land of knaves, — yes that is of course the land your father left you, insinuating that Wagner is a knave.

cf. Massinger's A new way to pay old debts II. 3 (p. 141 Mermaid-ed.):

when you are lord of this lady's manor, ... you may with the lease of glebeland, called Knave's acre, a place I would manure, requite your vassal."

l. 381. (IV, 24). whether thou beest with me, or no.

All the translators (at hand) take it = ± if thou servest me or not. (V. d. Velde, Modderman, Verwey). It is therefore not superfluous, I suspect, to refer *e. g.* to Romeo and Juliet II 4. 78: Was I with you there; cf. ib. III 5, 142: take me with you, and perhaps Merry Devil of Edmonton II, 1. 1.

So our line means: whether you understand me or not.

l. 384. (IV, 27). familiars.

These ‚attendant-demons' (Ward) were also called

flies cf. the N. E. D. *in v.v. familiar* and *fly*, and see Anglia 18, 334 for an other instance of *familiar* in the remarkable and mysterious Faustus-document that E. Flügel has unearthed (see *infra* note to l. 1470, *note*).

l. 394. (IV, 36). Mas, but for the name of French crowns *etc.*

A superficial commentator takes these lines to contain a ‚contemptuous comparison' of the French Crowns to English Counters cf. ante note to l. 356 *ad finem*. Very little reflection will show that this view is wrong. Wagner has handed some guilders to the clown. When the clown shows *more suo* that he has never heard of them by asking: Gridirons, what is that?, Wagner says: Well, they are French crowns, meaning it is no wonder you don't know what guilders are and he is evidently right in his supposition that the clown will know what French crowns are like, for the latter exclaims: Why, *but for* the name you give me now (French crowns) you might as well have given me English counters, for the name you mentioned first I did not know at all (Gridirons = Guilders). And so he accepts them. There is much virtue in *but for!*

Ward (p. CVII note 1) has unfortunately allowed himself to be taken in by Albers' ‚acute' remark!

l. 411. (IV, 52). Yonder tall fellow in the round slop.

Ward's note to the effect that ‚slops' are ‚breeches' (cf. Marlowe's translation in the first book of Lucan of *laxis . . . bracis* by *wear open slops*, Dyce, Works 1-vol. ed. p. 377, a.) might mislead one into the belief that *slop* was meant here for the same sort of wearing-apparel. Here however, slop (in singulari!) = ‚any kind of outer garment' (Wagner) at least a garment covering the upper part of the body as well as more or less of

the lower. See on this word Acad. May 31, 1890 p. 372, and Skeat's note to I. 422 of the Canterbury Tales. See ‚*a French slop*' in Daborne's A Christian turn'd Turk l. 1408 (Anglia 20, 231) and cf. *a German flop* in Thoms, E. E. Pr. Romances (second report of Dr. Faustus) III, 370, and Decker, Seven Deadly Sins, ed. Arber, p. 37, — where read *slops* for *flops*. From this latter quotation and from Stubbes, Anatomy of Abuses, ed. Furnivall (p. 77* and) p. 243 it appears that *slops* were also of Spanish make. But it is not certain which article of apparel is meant here.

l. 431. (IV. omitted in Ward's and Wagner's ed.)
Ile tickle the pretie wenches plackets.

As the clown talks of tickling the placket, the meaning cannot be a petticoat, a stomacher, or an opening in a petticoat *i. e.* pocket (cf. Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay I, 111,) but it must be part of the body. Halliwell gives the right meaning the word has here, *viz.* female pudendum, but without any references. More passages than sufficient to prove this meaning will be found in a note of R. G. White's to ‚Dread prince of Plackets' in L. L. L. III, 1. Let me add that *pace* White, the word must necessarily have the same meaning in: ‚And the news we heard was Q. M. (ary) conceiv'd .... Pray Heaven to strengthen her Majestie's Placket' quoted by White from the Poems on State Affairs vol I, pt. II, p. 185. See also White's note on King Lear III, 4, 94, with Furness' note on the same passage. See also the note to l. 736.

l. 438 (IV, 75). with *quasi vestigias nostras insistere.*

All Edd. keep the *with* here but no one explains it. Yet, it seems to me it could only be explained on the supposition that *quasi* etc. are the clown's words (as if Wagner said: You have your left eye fixed on

my right heel, with your own words etc.) and of course the Latin words are Wagner's. So I think we cannot but throw *with* out. But I cannot explain how it got in.

l. 463 (V, 23).Why, the signory of Emden shalbe mine.

Messrs. Ward and Wagner tell us many things of Emden but little that is relevant to the interpretation of this passage. To me it reads as though it referred to a real vacancy — s. v. v. — in the ‚signory' of Emden. I have been unable to find out whether in or about 1588 — when we must suppose Marlowe's play to have been written — there was anything like an interregnum. It can not be doubted that the allusion — if allusion there be — would be understood by an Elizabethan audience, Emden being, as Ward reports, well known to Englishmen of the Elizabethan Age.

For a similar case — an allusion to a vacancy being of some value for determining the time when a certain piece was written — see the castle of Gillispair and the vacancy in the Earldom of Kent in the recently discovered 15th century morality ‚Pride of Life' (cf. *e.g.* Morley, English Writers VII, 174.

It may be worth a couple of lines to draw attention to the possibility of finding additional evidence for the date 1588 — or counter-evidence for the matter of that.

l. 466 (V, 26). Cast no more doubts.

A reference to the N. E. D. *in voce* cast, sub VI, 37 b; 38; 41, a. b. and 42, 43 will show that Prof. Ward's ‚reckon up or consider' (no more doubts) is open to objection. See especially 42. b. cf. Dr. Murray's quotation for 1577: The Judge casting doubts with himselfe.

l. 482. (V, 42.) *Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.*

The origin of this saying is unknown. Wagner —

says Ward — traces its ‚purport' to Seneca: *est autem hoc ipsum solatii loco, inter multos dolorem suum dividere*, etc. But honour to whom honour is due, — the reference to Seneca is already found in Büchmann (ed. 1895 p. 283 seq.), who also refers to Thucydides, and who observes that „in the Middle Ages a hexameter was made up with a slight alteration of the sense which we find thus quoted in Dominicus de Gravina *(Chronic. de reb. in Apul. Gest. ab anno 1333—1350* cf. *Raccolta di varie chroniche* etc. *Nap.* 1781, II, 220): iuxta illud verbum poëticum: gaudium est miseris sòcios habuisse poenarum."

Dr. Binder, *Novus Thesaurus Adagiorum Latinorum* (Stuttgart, 1861, p. 354) referred me to Neander and Schonheim, and I expected to find perhaps a possible source indicated there. This hope proved vain, but the search was not quite without success for both these works give the proverb in a most startlingly different form, *viz.*: Solamen miser*um*, socios habuisse malorum.[1]) There is optimism turned into pessimism with a vengeance.

It sounds like a reminiscence of the form of this sentiment when we read in the Alexandreis of Gualtherus. [2])

„Hoc solamen et haec misero medicina malorum
Sortem nosse suam."

We get a hint of another form of our proverb by a marginal note in Ms. E. of the Canterbury Tales. See Skeat's Chaucer vol. IV, 533 l. 746 seq. where we read: *For unto shrewes Ioye it is and ese To have hir*

[1]) cf. *Ethice vetus et sapiens veterum latinorum sapientum sive Praecepta* etc. M. Neandri, Lipsiæ 1590, 8° p. 311, and *Proverbia illustrata et applicata* .... O. W. Schonheim, Leipzig, 1738, 8° p. 227.

[2]) M. Philippi Gualtheri ab Insulis Dicti De Castellione *Alexandreis* .... recensuit F. A. W. Mueldener. Lipsiæ, 1863; cf ib. IV. 31, 32.

felawes in peyne and disese; and ib. V p. 421 the note referred to: ‚Solacium miseriorium' *(sic.)* etc. In Prof. Skeat's note to which he himself was kind enough to call my attention, he also quotes Troilus 1, 708:

Men seyn, „to wrecche is consolacioun To have another felawe in his peyne".

In seventeenth century-texts I have found it quoted twice; once in the margin to Decker's Seven Deadly Sins (ed. Arber p. 12) and once in a pamphlet of 1609 on Ward and Danseker (cf. ante note to ll. 7 seq. for full title), — cf. ib. sign. C. 2, r°: *Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.*

The lines from Cædmon to which Prof. Ward refers: Uton odhvendan hit nû manna bearnum, thæt heofonrice, nû vê hit habban ne môton (Grein p. 16) do not express quite the same idea. It is the theory of our line turned inside out and put into practice and reminds me of the famous *varia lectio*: mundus vult decipi, — *decipiamus* ergo.

l. 483. (V, 43).

Why, have you any paine that tortures others?

Ward prints *torture* although he quite sees that *tortures* is defensible, because the latter reading ‚would here create an awkward ambiguity'. Surely that is an argument unworthy of the Editor of what purports to be — and what is! — a scholarly edition! Mr. Bullen who writes for the General Reader — that intellectual baby for whom all food must be specially prepared — does not think it so very indigestible since he leaves it unchanged.

ll. 489 seq.q. (V, 49 seq.q.)

Then [Faustus] stabbe thine arm couragiously.

Prof. Ward, writing in his Introduction (cf. p. C X seq.q.) on the influence of Marlowe's play upon con-

temporary literature quotes as a case in point the closing scene of Nash's Unfortunate Traveller, of which, he says, it is not likely that it ‚could have been written by one unacquainted with the contract-scene in the play', adding by way of afterthought, his philogical conscience pricking him into the confession that this conclusion is not without an alternative — „or at all events with the corresponding passage in the History from which the play was taken." *Or* suggests doubt as if no certainty could be arrived at. Why did not Prof. Ward compare the three passages in question? He would have seen at once that, as a matter of fact, Nash must have had the prose-history before him or in his mind, — as we shall see now.

. . . The veyne in his left hande . . . he pierst . . . . (Nash ap. Ward l.c.)	stab thine arm couragiously . . . View heere the blood that trickles from mine arme . . . . (Dr. Faustus ll. 489, 497.)	. . . he took a small penknife and prickt a vein in his left hande . . . . (E. F. B. p.p. 175, 176. Thoms).

See the note to l. 1470.

l. 509. (V. 69). (Stage direction:) a chafer of coals.

Prof. Ward's definition of a *chafer* as ‚a pan or brazier for heating coals' cannot of course be correct. It means: a vessel for heating something (here: Faustus' congealed blood) by means of coals. cf. the N.E.D. *in voce* and J. Wright Dialect Dict. *in v. chaffer.*

l. 529. (V. 89). receiue this scroll.

Such compacts seem to have struck people's imagination very forcibly, cf. „Faust and Mephistophiles at the Old Bailey Courthouse *temp.* Charles I" (Notes and Queries, Dec. 31, 1887, p. 521) where we have the whole scene acted over again. A certain Thomas Browne sells his soul to the devil for one thousand pounds yearly, and forty one (!) years of joyful life, etc. The jury found a true bill!

l. 540. (V, 98). whatsoever.

An analogous use of *whatsoever* without any verb following, I find in the fourteenth chapter of Fortescue's Englishing (1571) of Pedro Mexia's Silva de varia lecion (1543) as printed by A. Wagner in his Tamburlaine-edition. cf. ib. (p. VIII and) p. XIX: „he onelie then woulde execute Th' officers, Magistrates, maisters of housholdes and gouernours, pardonyng, and forgeuyng all others whatsoeuer".

See also R. I., the printer's preface to Tamburlaine: ‚Gentlemen, and curteous Readers whosoeuer' and cf. *infra* l. 550 (V. 109) wheresoever. A similar use is found in the E. F. B. ed. 1592 p. 5: That Mephistophiles should ‚doo for him whatsoeuer' (not: whatsoever *he desired*, as Thoms has, p. 173) and ib. p. 7: mine be it wheresoeuer, *i. e.* Thoms l.l. p. 177.

This last correction is interesting from an other point of view. For considering that the German text has: ‚dasz der Geist alles das thun solte was er begert, vnd von ihm haben wolt' (Spiess [1]) p. 18;

[1]) As I have continually to compare the text of the English F. B. to that of the German one, a word about the latter may not be out of place. As the title page of the 1592 ed. of the E. F. B. tells us that it was ‚amended according to the true Copie printed at Franckfort', there could be no doubt about the printed ‚Spiess' being the original of Mr. P. F.'s translation, but it is interesting to see that a comparison of the texts would lead to the same conclusion. For in the (German) 18th chapter there is a marginal note: ‚D. Faustus ein Astrologus und Calendermacher'. The German text does not contain this compound but the English text reads: fell to be a kalender-maker'. (Thoms p. 199). Of course the *marginalia* (not found in the Wolfenbüttel MS.) may be supposed to have been added for this print. If any proof of this should be required, I may refer my readers to Spiess-Braune p. 58. When Spiess — or whoever may have written out these *marginalia* for the press — came to the description of *Neapolis*, he read there of *ein herrlich Castell oder Burg*. Of course a castle is meant but our Frankfurt friend, thinking of the little town of Castel near Frankfurt (opposite Mainz, — of course Castel near Saarburg is out of the question) at once made an other marginal note of this as though it had been the name of a town!

Wolfenbüttel p. 16, 18 has substantially the same) and that the English 1592-text has the absolute *whatsoeuer* just like Marlowe, we see that our author must have had the English text before him. Indeed it must be apparent at a glance that Marlowe has copied out, he must have had the actual text before him — printed or in MS. — part of chapter the fourth, *i. e.* Thoms III p. 173, (*viz.* for l.l. 536—543) and part of chapter the sixth *i. e.* Thoms p. 176 (for ll. 543—550).

cf. *by these presents* l. 544 which is in the E. F. B. cf. Thoms p. 176, but not in the G. F. B. (See Spiess p. 20; Wolfenbüttel p. 21); *body and soul* ididem; *Lucifer* l. 545, Thoms *ib.* but nót in the G. F. B.; and cf. l. 548 *full power* etc., which is literally = Thoms p. 177. *all power* etc. whereas the German texts *(l.l.)* are different.

l. 598 (V, 156). peruse it thorowly.

Ward's note to the effect that *thorowly* is here redundant, as peruse = lat. pervisere *i. e.* to examine throughout, is not quite accurate. The meaning of a word cannot be established by giving its derivation. To peruse, whatever it may have meant at one time, is here evidently used = to look over. This meaning is abundantly established by at least seven quotations from Shakespeare in Schmidt's lexicon.

l. 619 (scene VI.) *Enter Faustus and Mephistophilis.*

Although Ward is agreed with the other commentators to begin a new scene here, he still thinks it „possible that the dialogue continued unbroken". I do not think it possible; l. 619: When I behold the heavens, then I repent, is absolute nonsense if it comes directly after Mephistophiles': Tut I warrant thee, of l. 618 and the cursing of Mephistophiles in l. 620 is then strange.

All this is on the contrary quite in point if we suppose a time to have elapsed during which he can have studied (behold, l. 619) heaven by means of the book which was given him only in l. 609: Now would I have a booke where I might see al characters and planets of the heauens, *etc.*

Guided by van de Velde's remark (*l.l.* p. 131, note 20) that Faust in his speech lower down probably refers to apparitions of magic, conjured up for him by Mephistophiles, Ward suggests that there may have been a dumb-show introducing these apparitions from classic mythology and Wagner thinks of a *diablerie*. Let it be remarked in passing that in itself the introduction of a dumb-show or a *diablerie* does not necessitate the assumption of a break in the scene (cf. *e.g.* the dumb-show in scene X of the 1616-quarto) so that this supposition is compatible with the assumption that the dialogue remains unbroken, although it does not militate against that view which assumes the break.

But this dumb-show can be supposed to have been introduced by Mephistophiles only, — there would be no *raison d'être* for it if the apparitions were raised by Faust himself. And Faustus says expressly (l. 645): Haue not *I* made blinde Homer sing to me? (infra note to l. 645) and in the same breath, — so, as the most natural explanation must make us interpret, referring to the same moment — he adds that Amphion (l. 647) has ‚made music' with Mephistophiles; this does not sound as though Mephistophiles were instrumental in producing these visions. As the power to raise such apparitions was conferred on Dr. Faustus only in ll. 605—607 (yet faine would I haue a book wherein I might beholde al spels and incantations, that I might raise vp spirits when I please) it is absolutely necessary to assume a break.

l. 645 (VI, 26).
Haue not I made blinde Homer sing to me, *etc.*

See note to l. 619. In an edition of the German *Faustbuch* which was published in 1590 and in which six new chapters are inserted, we find an account, in the third of these six, „how Doctor Faustus has lectured at Erfurt on Homer and how he has shown his audience the Grecian heroes". As Marlowe wrote his play before the publication of this German text the possibility is of course excluded that he should have found it there (an assumption already unlikely in itself.) So we must either look upon it as a curious coincidence, or assume that Marlowe and the author of the 1590 text had a common source. Ward [3] p. 195 recalls a statement by Moehsen (Scheible's Kloster, II p. 265 to the effect that „the real Dr. Faust summoned ‚the heroes of Homerus' before the students at Erfurt." Moehsen however, without specifying in any way speaks of ‚an old Erfurt Chronicle'. I should like to ask if this old *Chronicle* was perhaps the ‚chronicle' which speaks about Erfurt in connection with Faust *i. e.* the identical chapter of the 1590 Faust-text. I am unable to inquire into this further, having no access at present to Scheible's vol. II.

ll. 688 seq. (VI. 68 seq). *Faust.* Tell me who made the world?
Meph. I will not.

As E. Schmidt has already remarked (Jahrbuch für rom. und englische Sprache und Lit. N. F. II p. 57) this text is much more like the English F. B. than like the German text. There is even verbal resemblance. See Thoms III p. 204: Mephistophiles tell me how and after what sort God made the world. The German text of Spiess has: da fragte D. Faustus, er solte jhme Bericht thun wie Gott die Welt erschaffen hette (p.

46); the Wolfenbüttel MS. has: vnnd Fragt Doctor Faustus den Gaist darauff: Wie.... habe.

ll. 696 seq. (VI, 78 seq.)

Faust. Thinke, Faustus, vpon God that made the world.
Meph. Remember this.

Wagner in his critical commentary (p. 64) asks if l. 696 should not be attributed to the Good Angel (who may be supposed to have entered during this dialogue) and Ward adopts this reading.

But surely, this is impossible! In that case Mephistophiles' words ‚Remember this' must either refer to the words of the Good Angel or to what he himself said in l. 695 (Thou art damn'd). On neither supposition is there the slightest reason for Mephistophiles to go away, – he also staid during a former visit of the Angels who are of course not noticed by him; in fact, as they are but the incarnations or representations of Faustus' waverings in his inward soul between good and bad, their voice cannot be supposed to have been heard by Mephistophiles. And as his ‚Remember this' cannot mean as it is taken by some [1]): Remember that thou art damn'd, I take these words to mean: Thou shalt remember this *viz.* that Faustus has again pronounced God's name, against the covenant. [2])

Hence Mephistophiles hies away to fetch Lucifer who – *teste* ll. 713 seq.q.

> We come to tell thee thou dost iniure vs,
> Thou talk'st of Christ, contrary to thy promise
> Thou shouldst not think of God, thinke of the deuil –

has been informed of Faustus' calling upon God (Christ)

[1]) cf. *e. g.* Modderman's translation: Onthoud wat ik u gezegd heb. Het oudste Faust-Drama: Marlowe's.... Dr. Faustus vertaald enz., Groningen, 1887.

[2]) See also the note to l. 723.

and is come himself to impress Faustus with the fact that „such a thing is not to happen again!"

Nowhere are the reflexions of the Angels interrupted save by Faustus alone and we have just seen that this is not for a merely external reason. Faustus is the only one to ‚hear' their voices.

l. 704 (VI 85). race thy skin

See *ante*, note to l. 16.

l. 716 (VI, 97). and of his dame too.

It looks very tempting to regard these words with all the commentators as actors' gag, especially if we recall Mr. Fleay's ‚excellent conjecture' (Ward; but note that *more suo* Fleay gives it as a fact.) that it was „introduced *c.* May 1600, when The Devil and his Dame by Haughton was on the Stage."

May I ask: Why could it not be Marlowe's? Which is its inherent incompatibility with the popular playwright? Cunningham, who so far as I can see was the first to reject it, does not vouchsafe any reason, it ‚must have been gag'. Wagner and Bullen adopt this view; Ward, evidently struck by Fleay's observation, offers no objection if no argument either. Is it too rough an expression for Marlowe to use? The word is as old as Langland (who uses it already in connection with Belial; cf. the N. E. D. *i. v.*) and the expression *the devil and his dam* is quoted by Dr. Murray as early as 1538 and is quite a common one, — Schmidt in his Shakespeare Lexicon gives no less than nine references [1]) for it. So again: why could not Marlowe have used it himself?

And see how weak is the case for the ‚excellent'

[1]) cf. Jonsons The Devil is an Ass, III 1. ed. Cunningham II, 248 and Thoms E. E. Prose Rom. III 350 (Second Report of Dr. Faustus).

conjecture, when we come to think of it, *viz.*, that it should have been introduced *c.* 1600 — see *supra.* We know that the A-text in which it occurs was entered in 1601 in the Stationers' Registers, so that it must have been ready then, and we have no proof whatsoever that the play was acted — and surely only when it was acted, could ‚gag' be introduced — after 1597 when the enthusiasm for the play had evidently slowly been dying out. I therefore look upon it as very unlikely that any *gag* was introduced into the play in 1600.

l. 723. (VI, 104).

Faustus, we are come from hel to shew thee some pastime.

See the next note on l. 732. Delius (ll. p. 12) has already noticed the resemblance to the E. F. B. and draws the conclusion that because it is prose, it cannot be Marlowe's. What Delius says about its being in contradiction with l. 713: We come to tell thee thou dost iniure vs, is not accurate. Lucifer considers himself injured because Faustus has, the covenant notwithstanding, (see my note to l. 696) again pronounced God's name.

l. 732. (VI, 112). *The Seven Deadly Sins.*

Dr. Wagner delivers the verdict, but without an atom of proof, that „the prose that follows here is not by Marlowe, but by some inferior hand". (p. 120) And for the sake of completeness, it should be added that the same thing is insinuated — again without proof — in the Shakespeare Jahrbuch vol. 21 p. 223. In default of combatants, the combat usually ceases, — here I can only say that I shall be interested to see it begin.

Of greater interest is the question: Whence did Marlowe draw this ‚happiest of additions made ... to the legend' (Düntzer, apud Ward[3] p. 174)? On pp. 120,

121, Ward has enumerated many works in which the *peccata mortalia* occur, and many others might undoubtedly be found [1]) which testify to the popularity of the subject, but it would seem — it is at least not impossible — that Marlowe did not introduce it without receiving a hint from the prose version which in other places he followed so faithfully.

For we read in the E. F. B. that Lucifer says (Thoms III p. 205): „Faustus .... I am come to visit thee, and to shew thee some hellish pastimes, in hope" etc. And when Faustus expresses his readiness to see „what pastime you can make" we read: At which words the great devil ... sate him down ... commanding the rest of the devils to appear in the form as they were in hell". And then Faustus is visited by seven devils *viz.* Belial as a bear; Belzebub as a bull; Astaroth as a worm; Cannagosta as an ass; Anobis as a dog; Dithican as a bird and Brachus (Spiess: Drachus; Wolfenbüttel: Dracus) as a hedgehog.

Now it will be noticed that, when in Marlowe's play l. 723, Lucifer says: ‚Faustus, we are come from hel to shew thee some pastime',seven deadly sins appear at the command of Lucifer. The resemblance in situation and in the very words is so striking that we can only conclude that Marlowe, when writing this scene, had the passage of the E. F. B. before him and I shall now make the connection between the seven deadly sins and the seven devils more apparent.

This concatenation, this association of ideas which I presuppose in Marlowe's mind will, I think, at once be admitted if I can show the assumption of such a

---

[1]) e. g. The world and the Child; the Ancren Rewle; a poem on this subject from Ms. Vesp. A. III printed by Morris in vol. 6 of Lemcke's Jahrbuch *u. s.*

connection necessary to the explanation of other passages. Now we find

1° The seven deadly sins represented as connected with certain animals.

cf. the Fairy Queen, I canto IV. stanza 18 etc. where Idleness rides on an ass, Gluttony on a swine, Lechery on a goat, Avarice on a camel etc.; and „in the Ancren Riwle p. 198 the seven deadly sins are typified by seven wild animals; the lion being the type of pride, the serpent of envy, the unicorn of wrath, the bear of sloth, the fox of covetousness, the swine of greedinesse, and the scorpion of lust" (quoted from Dr. Furness' ed. of King Lear, p. 191 and which I am unable at present to verify) and see the passages in King Lear to which this is quoted as a commentary. Compare moreover Marlowe's Dr. Faustus l. 750.

2° Certain devils to be connected with certain animals.

See the Faustbuch — (Spiess ed. Braune, p.p. 47, 48 = Milchsack, p.p. 46, 47) *i. e.* Thoms III, 205 as quoted above, and cf. l. 1335 of our B-text with l. 1440.

3° Certain devils to be directly connected with certain sins. See (The Historie of Frier Rush in) Thoms, Early Engl. Prose Romances, I, 264 where „Belphegor who was Prince of Gluttony, Asmodeus Prince of Lechery, and Belzebub Prince of Envie" are mentioned (cf. also p. 285) and especially: „Leviathan tempteth with pride, Mammon attempteth by avarice, Asmodeus seduceth by leachery, Beelzebub incideth' (read: inciteth) ‚to enuy, Baall Berith provoketh to ire, Belphegor moueth to gluttony, Astorath(!) perswadeth to cloth" (read: *sloth*), quoted by O. Francke (The Life and Death of Doctor Faustus, Heilbronn 1886 p. XXXVIII) from a pamphlet of 1599: „Wits Theatre of the little world".

So, what I cannot but suppose to have happened is that Marlowe, finding the names of the devils conjoined

with animals in his source (as *sub* 2°), and remembering the connection of the latter with the seven deadly sins (as *sub* 1°), associated the devils directly in his mind with the *sins* (as *sub* 3°) and hence substituted the latter for the former.

Whilst patiently waiting for the arguments of those who would like to continue to hold that this scene is not by Marlowe, it can do no harm to show that it could hardly be any one else's. As the reader will find developed elsewhere in this publication (see chapter II), Marlowe must have had the English Faustbook lying before him when writing his play. And whatever my readers may think of the hypothesis concerning the prototype of the Seven Deadly Sins being found in the English Faustbook, one thing will not be denied, *viz.* that the author of this scene had those words from the E. F. B.: „Faustus..... I am come to visit thee, and to show thee some of our hellish pastimes" in his mind when he wrote l. 723 of our text [1]), and could this have been any one but Marlowe? For only he whom we must assume to have had the E. F. B. before him for so many other passages can be supposed to have gone to it for these words: „we are come from hel to shew thee some pastime". And this man is Marlowe.

l. 736. (VI, 116).
I am like to *Ouids* flea, I can creepe into euery corner of a wench.

Prof. Ward, in his note on *Ouids flea*, might have added that the ‚Carmen de Pulice' is by *Ofilius Sergianus;* cf. Teuffel Röm. Lit. I, 575. It has been published several times; I mention only the ed. of 1826 by N. E. Lemaire at Paris in vol. 7 of the Poetæ Latini Minores. (vol. 94 of the whole collection).

[1]) See the preceding note.

As this commentary is not a ‚Babees-book' (and see lower down), there can be no objection to the somewhat *risqué* text finding a place here.

1. Parve pulex et amara lues, inimica puellis | Carmine quo fungar in tua facta ferox? | Tu laceras corpus tenerum, durissime, morsu; | Cujus quum fuerit plena cruore cutis, | 5. Emittis maculas nigro de corpore fuscas, | Laevia membra quibus commaculata rigent. | Dumque tuum lateri rostrum defigis acutum, | Cogitur e somno surgere virgo gravi. | Perque sinus erras; tibi pervia caetera membra; | 10. Is quocumque placet; nil tibi, saeve, latet. | Ah! piget, et dicam, quum strata puella recumbit, | Tu femur avellis, cruraque aperta subis. | Ausus es interdum per membra libidinis ire, | Et turbare locis gaudia nata suis. | 15.Dispeream, nisi jam cupiam fieri meus hostis, | Promptior ut fieret ad mea vota via. | Si sineret natura mihi, quo verterer in te, | Ed quod sum natus, posse redire daret: | Vel si carminibus possem mutarier ullis, | 20. Carminibus fierem ad mea vota pulex: | Aut medicaminibus, si plus medicamina possunt, | Vellem naturæ jura novare meæ. | Carmina Medeæ, vel quid medicamina Circes | Contulerint, res est notificata satis. | 25. His ego mutatis, si sic mutabilis essem, | Haererem in tunicae margine virgineae. | Inde means per crura meae sub vesta puellae, | Ad loca, quae vellem, me cito subriperem. | Cumque illa dudum, laedens nil ipse, cubarem, | 30.Donec de pulice rursus homo fierem. | Sed si forte novis virgo perterrita monstris, | Exciret famulos ad mea vincla suos: | Aut lenita meis precibus succumberet illa, | Aut mox ex homine verterer in pulicem. | 35. Rursus mutatus, fundensque precamina mille. Accirem cunctos in mea vota Deos; | Illam tum precibus, vel vi superator haberem, | Et jam nil mallet quam sibi me socium.

See ib. p.p. 176 seq. and 275 seq.q. The bearing of this text on the passage under consideration as well as on a previous one, *viz.* l.l. 428 seq.q. (cf. the note to l. 431) is unmistakeable. Marlowe may have had such lines as nos. 9, 26, and 28 before his mind.

Among the rather amusing collection of prose and ‚poetry' on this flighty animal, to be found in the *Amphitheatrum Sapientiae Socraticae Joco-seriae* by C. Dor-

navius where our text is also printed (ed. 1619 f°. p. 27), I find one other passage — in cursory reading; there may be more — resembling our text; if the mention of a virgin's rosy lips in connection with a flea constitutes a point of resemblance.

Pungere namque modo radiantia virginis ora | Et leni morsu sollicitare iuvat. | Nunc roseas mordere genas, nunc lactea colla | Ipsaque Paestanis aemula labra rosis, etc.

ib. Barnabae Brissonii Pulex Catharinae des Roches.

In the German Tugend und Liebesstreit (1677) which goes back to an English original, Pickelhäring says of the ‚Princessin von Cypern': Ich wolte, dass Sie eine Floh were und sässe in meinem Bette, ich wolte ihr das stechen wohl vertreiben." (cf. Meissner, Die Englischen Comoedianten zur Zeit Shakespeares, 1884, p.114.)

But I must not try to pursue this subject any further, which too easily eludes one's grasp.

l. 738. (VI, 118). indeed I doe.

As Marlowe is supposed to ridicule the Puritans in this play (cf. note to l. 224) it is perhaps worth while to remark that this m a y be another case in point. For *indeed* must have been the length to which Puritans went in the matter of swearing; cf. Decker's Seven Deadly Sins (ed. Arber.) p. 13: Sometimes hee's a Puritane, he sweares by nothing but In deede. These words are omitted in the B-text. See *ante* note 1 to p. 36.

l. 741. (VI, 120) cloth of Arras.

cf. the Times Whistle ed. E. E. T. S. p. 36 l. 1044. Tamburlaine ed. Wagner l. 2527.

l. 750. (VI, 128). *Wrath* ... leapt out of a lions mouth.

See Fairie Queene I, 4, 33, where Wrath is also mentioned in connection with a lion:

> And him beside rides fierce revenging Wrath
> Upon a lion, loth for to be led.

l.l. 770-776. (VI, 147-152).

Gluttony's speech comes to this: I am produced by an overindulgence in bacon, claret, pickled-herring (which is the reading of B. 714 for the Pickle-Herring of A.) beef and Marchbeer, — those delicacies constituting her *Progeny*, which here still means *ancestors*. cf. Coriolanus 1. 8. 12: the Hector that was the whip of your bragged progeny. ‚Marchbeere of two years old' (cf. Ward[3], note to l. 151) is mentioned in the Second Report of Dr. Faustus (See Thoms III, p. 370). In Thomas Heywood's English Traveller (III, 4) will be found a passage very much like the one under consideration in so much as in both the proper names used recall the taste for strong and deep drinking your Elizabethans and Jacobaeans delighted in.

The clown says „This is market day, and .... whom have I encountered? My gossip Pint-pot, and brim-full; nay I mean to drink with you before I part. And how doth all your worshipful kindred? your sister Quart your pater Pottle .... and your grandsire Gallon"? (Mermaid Series p. 211).

In a scene of Greene's James the Fourth (IV, 3) the resemblance is vaguer: „I am Slipper [1]..... Guidwife Calfe [2]) was my grand mother, and Goodman Neatherleather mine unckle", — so here proper names are chosen in order to establish a connection between the ‚progeny' and the trade.

l. 787. (VI, 162). minx.

This is probably a Gipsy word. See the Englische Studien 22, 328. See an absurd derivation (from meox = filth!) which savours of the prehistoric times in the Modern Language Notes 7, 268.

[1]) Slipper says he's the *neer kinsman* of a shoomaker.

[2]) Other copies read *Barke* and *Clarke*.

l.l. 790 seq. (VI, omitted by Ward.)

I am one that loues an inch of raw Mutton better then an ell of fride Stockfish, and the first letter of my name begins with Leachery.

There can hardly be any doubt that the reading of all the Quartos in our present state of knowledge should be allowed to stand. It is not only a well-known modern joke (see Notes and Queries 1887, I, 285) but also a ‚venerable old' one (see Daniel *apud* Ward[3] p. 176). For all that, it should be noted that if we ever get any other reason to substitute *L.* for *Lechery*, two considerations would speak in its favour. 1° We have then a pun, very much in the manner of the Elizabethans on ‚an *ell* of fride Stockfish' and the letter *L.*, and 2° the very fact that the traditional reading is an old joke would explain, what must then (perhaps) be looked upon as the ‚corruption' into Leachery.

Mutton is here used in the meaning of prostitute, in which it is not only known at present (see Hotten's Slang Dictionary *in voce.*) but in which it was also used by Shakespeare (cf. Measure f. M. III, 2, 192, and 2 Henry, IV, II, 4, 376). *Laced Mutton* which is also by some commentators supposed to be used by Shakespeare in the same sense (Two Gentlemen of Verona, 1. 1. 102) can hardly have this meaning there. It is indeed not likely that Speed should call Julia a strumpet to her lover and that Proteus should pass it over in silence.

B 733. (A. 793). *Lucifer.* Away to hell, away, on Piper!
Exeunt the 7 sinnes.

I should like to suggest that the words ‚on Piper' which it would be difficult to explain as part of the text, form a stagedirection, — an injunction to the Piper to begin playing. If this view be correct, there would be actual contemporary authority for the music which accompanied the Seven Sins during the Elizabethan

Stage Society's performance in July 1896. At the same time we see that the B-text was printed from a prompter's copy.

l. 800. (VI, 172). take this booke.

Ward says this book is not mentioned in the Faustbuch. It will be found referred to on p. 48 (of Spiess-Braune; cf. p. 47 of Milchsack): wurffen jm ein Zauberbüchlin dar, er solte seine Prob auch thun, das thät er. In the corresponding portion of the English text we find: „Then Lucifer put forth his paw and gave Faustus a book saying, Hold, do what thou wilt" etc. and in either text Faustus proceeds to some conjuring tricks with his own body. It will be noticed that the wording (cf. *book* as against *Zauberbüchlin*) and the situation (Lucifer against the plural sie) in the E. F. B. are closer to Marlowe than the German text.

l. 812. (VII, 6).

Drawne by the strength of yoky dragons' necks.

From an entry in Henslowe's diary to the importance of which passage Wagner was the first to draw attention, we see that 'j dragon in fostes' appears among the properties of the Lord Admirals men for it is mentioned in the inventory taken on the 10th of March 1598. Wagner and Ward hesitate as to whether this dragon was used for Faustus to alight ‚in his dragon-chariot' at l. 818 (scene VII) or whether it refers to the lines only found in the B-text, where we read that Faustus is *mounted upon a dragon's back.*

Wagner's alternative is no alternative as he expresses himself here [1]) for B. l.l. 803 seq.q.

[1]) And Wagner would be wrong if he should have thought of B. l. 799: From East to West his Dragons swiftly glide, for this reference to past adventures necessitated a stage-property as little as the one in A. l. 812 = B. l. 792.

„But new exploits do hale him out again, And mounted then vpon a Dragons back... He now is gone... and... will first arrive at Rome" in connection with l. 818, where we find him at Rome, shows that the Dragon mentioned in the line quoted by Wagner (B. 804) must be the one used for l. 818.

Now Bullen has argued that the lines of the B-text 793—804 must be by Marlowe (Introduction p. XXXI), as they were ‚beyond the reach of Birde or Samuel Rowley, (and) give precisely what (is) wanted.' It would be very tempting to conclude that the preceding considerations bear out Bullen's contention since we know now that before the performances were stopped in 1597 (Ward[3] p. LXIII) a Dragon was used which is mentioned in the B-text.

Unfortunately, one reflection makes us pause: Although the Dragon must have been used in or before 1597, the reference to it in the Chorus might have been added afterwards.

The Dragons are mentioned in the E. F. B. as well as in the G. F. B. but in the former with the addition (p. 215): „and all the waggon was of a light burning fire", whereas the German text (Spiess p. 54) has: „der war Hellischer Flammenweisz zu sehen. (Milchsack p. 53: Der Wag ward hellischer Flammen weisz anzusehen) cf. Delius p. 15.

B. l. 802. (after A. l. 812.)
To rest his bones after his weary toyle.

See the N. E. D. *in voce,* sub 2; the bones = the person. I am afraid that Dr. Murray's observation *ibid.* that it is thus used ‚with pathetically humorous force' will have to be modified. It certainly does not hold for the extract given from Julius Caesar V, 5, 41, where Brutus says, when about to commit suicide:

‚Night hangs upon mine eyes, my bones would rest, That have but laboured to attain this hour'. And I fail to see how it could be pathetic or humorous here.

l. 814. (Chorus l. 8). as I guesse.

„This phrase, now considered an Americanism" — says Ward — „occurs several times in Shakespeare." Well, a phrase may occur in Shakespeare and be an Americanism at present for all that; the discussion of this question would however here be irrelevant. It may be worth while to note that it is not *as I guesse,* but *I guess* which constitutes the Americanism, when used by the American cousin in his own peculiar way.

ll. 821 seq. (VII, 4).

With walles of flint, and deepe intrenched lakes,
Not to be wonne by any conquering prince.

The German text has nothing about walls or intrenched lakes but mentions ‚einen Pallast, ... so fest, dasz sie keinen feind zu fürchten haben'. (Spiess p. 57; Milchsack p. 57). The E. F. B. mentions ‚a mighty large castle that was built with brick, with three walls and three great trenches, so strong that it was impossible for any prince's power to win it'. (p. 222)

l. 824. (VII, 7). We sawe the river *Maine* fall into *Rhine*.

Compare ‚where the river of Maine *falls* into the Rhine' (Thoms III, 222) with Spiess-Braune p. 58 ‚da der Mayn in Rhein fleuszt' (Wolfenbüttel: da der Main hin fleust, p. 57).

l. 828. (VII, 11).

the streetes straight forth, and pau'd with finest bricke.

Compare ‚the streets fair and large, and streight forth ..... and all the pavement of the city was of brick' (Thoms p. 223) with Spiess p. 57 (= Wolfenbüttel p. 58) where there is no equivalent for this passage.

ll. 830 seq.q. (VII, 13 seq.q.).

There sawe we learnèd Maroes golden tombe,
The way he cut [,] an English Mile in length,
Thorough a rocke of stone in one nights space.

The E. F. B. (Thoms III, p. 223) has: there saw he the tomb of Virgil, and the highway that he cut through the mighty hill of stone in one night, the whole length of an English Mile'. There is no equivalent in the G. F. B.

l.l. 834 seq. (VII, 17 seq.).

In midst of which a sumptuous Temple stands
That threats the starres with her aspiring top.
[Whose frame is paued with sundry coloured stones
And roof't aloft with curious worke in gold!]
[from the B-texts].

That the reading of the B-texts: ‚In *one* of which' gives better sense than that of the two first Qq. is true; I have my doubts however if *midst*, gives nonsense which alone would justify its being thrown out. However that be, the ‚sumptuous temple' cannot but refer to Venice. It is true that as Ward (whose notes are continually muddled up by his half-abandoned notion that the German Faustbuch is Marlowe's source) says, ‚the corresponding passages in the Faustbuch leave some doubt as to which church is intended' but, as he himself remarks, the ‚epithet sumptuous is applied to St. Mark's at Venice in the English History' and as we here find Marlowe again merely writing out the E. F. B. the comparison of the English text removes all doubt. It is again Ward who has remarked that ‚the author of the additional lines in the quarto of 1616' as he calls him (see *supra* note to l. 812) understood them to apply to St. Mark's as they can only refer to its ‚wonderful mosaic work'. But Prof. Ward does not see what use can be made of this fact. These lines are not in what he, Ward, considers to be Marlowe's

source, *viz.* the German text (cf. Spiess p. 58), but they are in the E. F. B. See Thoms p. 223:

„He wonder'd not a little at the fairness of St. Mark's Place and the sumptuous church standing thereon, called St. Mark, how all the pavement was set with coloured stones and all the rood or loft of the church double gilded over". The copying is again very faithful.

Now if we suppose these two lines which are not found in the A-text, to have been added by Messrs. Bird and Rowley we must assume that they have gone in for a minute comparison of Marlowe's text with the E. F. B. I have no hesitation in saying that such a proceeding is unimaginable and think there can be no doubt that these two lines must have been found originally in A. This, if true, is additional evidence for my contention that sumptuous refers to Venice and to Venice alone.

And to Venice alone, for line 835 would not (pace Ward) ‚seem rather to indicate the church of St. Antonio at Padua'. His reason for this statement is that ‚the description is inapplicable to St. Marks, while in the Faustbuch Padua is mentioned as possessing a beautiful ‚church with a tower (Thumkirch).' But a *Thumbkirch* is not a ‚church with a tower' but one with a cupola, so there is no equivalent in the G. F. B. The line is, *as it stands*, certainly not specially applicable to St. Marks (but neither is it so to Padua,) and one very slight emendation would make it fit in to a T. We must perhaps read ‚That threats the starres with her aspiring tops'. Everyone who has ever seen a picture of St. Marks (to refer to a very easily accessible book, especially to German readers, — cf. Brockhaus 14th ed. 9, 780) will concede this at once.

It is perhaps worth while to add that the adjective

sumptuous is still found five times in this chapter, once (Thoms p. 222) as applied to Trent, where the G. F. B. has *unglaublichen grossen*, and four times (Thoms p.p. 231, 233, 235, 236,) without any equivalent in the G. F. B.

l.l. 850 seq. (VII, 33 seq.)

Just through the midst runnes flowing Tybers streame
With winding bankes that cut it in two parts.

See Spiess-Braune (p. 58)... Rom, welche ligt bey einem Fluss Tyberis genannt, so mitten durch die Statt fleusst (Milchsack: laufft); the E. F. B. has .... ‚Rome, which lay, and doth yet lie on the river Tybris, the which divideth the city into two parts' (Thoms III p. 224). Again the English text is slightly closer to Marlowe than the German one.

The two lines under discussion are not found in the A-text. That they are Marlowe's however will be clear to any one who admits the reasoning applied *supra* in the notes to l.l. 812, 834.

l. 852. (VII, 35). foure stately bridges.

In Thoms (III, 224) we read of ‚four great stone bridges', whereas there is no equivalent in Spiess (nor of course in the Wolfenbüttel MS.)

ll. 854 seq.q. (VII, 37).

Upon the bridge call'd Ponte Angelo,
Erected is a Castle passing strong,
Within whose walles such store of ordinance are
And double Canons, fram'd of carued brasse,
As match the dayes within one compleate yeare.

Thoms III 224: and upon the one bridge, called Ponte St. Angelo is the Castle of St. Angelo, wherein are so many great cast pieces as there are days in the year *etc.* There is no equivalent in the G. F. B. cf. the *Encyclopædic Dict.* V, 79 for a picture of this castle of S. Angelo.

ll. 859 seq. (VII, 42 seq.)

Besides the gates and high piramides,
Which *Julius Cæsar* brought from *Affrica.*

Prof. Ward suggests that ‚Marlowe was thinking of' a certain obelisk and not of these pyramids, as it was beyond Cæsars power to bring the pyramids across. Marlowe was not thinking at all, — he was just *more suo* faithfully copying out the E. F. B.: where he saw that pyramid that Julius Cæsar brought forth of Africa (Thoms III, 225) There is no equivalent in the G. F. B.

l. 870. (VII, 53). Whose *summum bonum* is in belly-cheare.

Summum bonum, an expression used in *ethics* „employed by ancient philosophers to denote that end in the following and attainment of which, the progress, perfection, and happiness of human beings consist", (Enc. Dict.) but here of course loosely used for: greatest pleasure.

ll. 870 seq.q. (VII, 54 seq.q.)

On p. 130 of his ed. Wagner says that the word bellycheer ‚has occurred before in one of the interpolated scenes' and as it is found in l. 870, we must conclude that, according to Wagner, scene VII is interpolated. This might mean that the whole scene is not genuine, but his note to l. 55 (p. 124) leads me to think that it is only the subsequent lines that Wagner objects to. It is only for completeness' sake that I mention the passage here, for so far as Wagner produces any argument at all, it is that of buffoonery which *circulus vitiosus* I shall have to meet elsewhere (see infra, chapter II.)

Ward, hesitating apparently with regard to the whole of this scene ‚whether it was written by Marlowe or not' (note *ad* l. 61, p. 182, *i. e.* l. 878) is at least sure

of lines 873, 874 (VII, 56, 57). ‚Then charme me, that I May be invisible to do what I please, unseen of any whilst I stay in Rome'. Of these lines he says that they ‚are corrupt or more probably an insertion', but does not vouchsafe any argument. I can only ask why should they be inserted? Even for what follows only in A the rendering invisible is necessary — see the preceding paragraph. And if I place myself for a moment on Wagner's standpoint which Ward is hesitating, as we have seen, to adopt, I can only take Ward at the letter and say that the lines he rejects, are necessary for the two following ones — which he evidently retains, as why should he not? —

Meph. So Faustus, now
Do what thou wilt, thou shalt not be discerned.

As to l.l. 873 seq. being corrupt, Bullen's conjecture

Then charme me, Mephistophilis, that I
May be *etc.*

seems to me very apt. But this question I need not here enter into.

In The New Inn (I, 1 ed. Cunningham II, p. 347); Ben Jonson gives us the recipe for rendering invisible. When Lovel asks Ferret how it was that ‚The Lords' have seen him, Ferret answers:

Because indeed I had | No medicine, sir, to go invisible | No fernseed in my pocket; nor an opal | Wrapt in bay leaf in my left fist to charm | Their eyes with.

B. 1. 900. (Stage Direction.)
Enter ... Bishops ... bearing ... Pillars.

A Pillar is ‚a portable ornamental column carried before a cardinal as emblematic of his support to the Church'. Enc. Dict.

B. l. 901. *Pope.* Cast downe our Foot-stoole.

I do not remember seeing it noticed [1]) that an incident, in all essentials similar to this one, occurs in Marlowe's Tamburlaine. See A. Wagner's ed. p.p. 62, 63. First part. Actus IV scena II, l. 1439:

Tamburlaine. Bring out my foot-stoole!

Then Baiazeth is taken out of his cage and Tamburlaine with many ‚prowd audacious' words *‚gets up vpon him to his chaire'*, after having made him ‚Stoop, villaine, stoop!' (l. 1460) just as in this Faustus-text the Pope ‚From *Bruno's* backe, ascends Saints *Peters* Chaire' (l. 910) after having told him to ‚lie groueling' and to ‚crouch before the Papall dignity' (l. 908).

Only a parallelomaniac would make this the text for a discourse in order to prove, *ad libitum*, either that this is an additional argument why this scene of the B-text could not be by Marlowe (because this similarity points to imitation of one author by another), or that Marlowe, being the author of Tamburlaine, must needs be also responsible for this scene of the B-texts (because this similarity points to identity of the authors).

l. 884. (VII, 68). I thanke you sir. [*Snatches the dish.*

In l. 888 we have the same stagedirection and in l. 890 a similar one (cf. the note to that line). As this incident was dramatised undoubtedly from the hint contained in the E. F. B. (in Thoms III, p. 227) where we find, *plate, dish and cup* mentioned, I suppose that *plate* must be substituted for *dish* in l. 888. No equivalent in the German text.

[1]) After this had been written I found it noticed by O. Fischer, *Zur Charakteristik der Dramen Marlowe's*, p. 9 with two more parallels between Tamburlaine and the Bruno-scenes. Of these two, one is scarcely of interest; *(viz.* Their superstitious bells in I Tamburlaine III, 3, 237, and their superstitious books in Faust B. l. 927) the other is important enough: And lift thy lofty arm into the clouds in I Tamburlaine II, 3, 51; cf. Faust B, 946: Lifting his loftie head aboue the clouds.

l. 890. (VII, 74). Ile pledge your grace. [*Snatches the Cup.*

Here again the text, as we have it, is closer to the E. F. B. than to the German one, for while the latter has: „Er schickte auch seinen Geist wider dahin, der must jm nur den besten Wein von dess Bapsts Tisch bringen, sampt den silbern Bechern und Kanten", (p. 60) we have in Thoms (III, 227) Faust addressing Mephistophiles in the following terms: „Come let us be merry, for thou must fetch me some wine, and the cup that the pope drinks out of; and hereupon morte caval, [1]) we will make good cheer" etc.

ll. 891 seqq. (VII, 75 seqq.)
My lord, it may be some ghost newly crept out of purgatorye [,] come to begge a pardon of your holinesse.

The E. F. B. has: ‚The pope perswaded his company that it was a damned soul' and speaks of its ‚delivery out of purgatory' (Thoms III, 226 — whereas the corresponding passage in Spiess runs: Der Bapst beredet das Gesinde, es were eine verdampte Seele; (Spiess and Wolfenbüttel p. 59) so that the G. F. B. does not mention the purgatory at all.

l. 894. (VII, 77) a dirge.

The word is here used in the expanded sense of funeral service (cf. Ward's note) which the pope thought would ‚lay the fury of the ghost' since it would deliver him out of purgatory (cf. note to l. 891). As masses are said for the dead, as well as dirges, the two words are easily interchanged, and Marlowe uses *dirge* here instead of *mass* of the E. F. B.

The word *placebo* is found in a similar sense (as mentioned by Ward q. v.); see *e. g.* Caxton's Reynard

[1]) Read *monte caval*, probably = a vague sort of exhortative *e. g.* never say die, cheer up, come on. See Mod. Language Notes April, 1898.

ed. Arber p. 11: Tho begonne they placebo domino, *etc.* and is often used in a different sense, *viz.* to curry favour. See Halliwell and Nares ed. Halliwell *in voce;* Skeat 's Chaucer 5, 338. Hence also I suppose the name of one of the Dramatic Personæ in Sir David Lyndsay's Satire of the Three Estates, Placebo: Flattery; cf. Morley Engl. Writers VII, 256.

In l. 918 the word dirge is used in a sense which does not tally with the context. For in view of the present tense: *disturbeth*, Dirge would seem to refer to the ceremony which is going on and this is neither a dirge nor a mass but the service of excommunication which is foreshadowed in l. 902. (cf. *e. g.* Nares, I, 72, ed. Halliwell). And to assume that *disturbeth* is a misprint for *disturbed* does not help us out of the difficulty for in the stagedirection after l. 907 it is found in the same way. Moreover as the Pope has ordered (l. 894) the Friars to *prepare a Dirge* it stands to reason that we cannot throw out the stagedirection but that it belonged to the original text as a necessary complement to l. 894. We are therefore driven to assume that between this stagedirection and l. 908 or possibly between l. 909 and l. 910 a passage has dropped out.

I must here ask my readers to look at the note to l. 915, and I think it important to add that the conclusion formulated there, was arrived at entirely independently of the same conclusion above.

ll. 897 seq.q. (VII, 79 seq.q.)

What, are you crossing of your selfe?
(St. dir.): *Crosse againe, and Faustus hits him a boxe of the eare, and they all runne away.*

Whereas Spiess has (p. 59): „wann der Bapst essen wollt, so macht er ein Creutz vor sich, so offt es dann

geschahe, bliess D. Faustus ihm in das Angesicht, (the Wolfenbüttel MS. has substantially the same), we find a passage in the E. F. B. which is much more like Marlowe's text: ‚and as he sate at meat the pope would ever be blessing and crossing over his mouth: Faustus would suffer it no longer, but up with his fist and smote the pope on his face." (Thoms III, 226). But the comparison of these passages is interesting in another respect, for it clearly shows us the genesis of the slap in the face of the Pope, The English for *blasen* being *to blow*, our friend P. F. either by way of a joke [1]) or through ignorance [2]) took to blow in the sense of to smite and accordingly used this word.

l. 902. (VII, 84.)

We shal be curst with bell book and candle.

See the note to l. 894. E. Schmidt has already noticed (*l.l.* p. 61) the closer resemblance to the English text here than to the G. F. B. Dr. Delius (p. 17) says that no importance can be attached to this case, because the formula is found elsewhere. Of course it is, but although Marlowe need not have gone to the E. F. B. in order to find it there, there can be no doubt (in view of the circumstance that he uses it so often) that as a matter of fact he did find it there. Not in the G. F. B.

l. 906. (VII, 88).

Anon you shal heare a hogge grunt, a calfe bleat, and an asse braye, because it is *S. Peters* holy day.

These twenty one words, — which Prof. Ward cuts up into two lines, making braye rhyme to

[1]) Of which he was very fond, — cf. his account of Costnitz = Cost me nothing (Thoms III, 231) which is not in the original.

[2]) Which is by no means impossible, — cf. his blundering translation of *entbehren* exposed in the note to l. 1463.

day, and which occur only in the A-texts, not in the later Quartos, — do not seem to me so exceedingly suspicious, as Delius (p. 17) would have it, on account of the rhyme, for why should not Marlowe indulge in an occasional rhymed couplet just as Shakespeare? See ll. 904, 905; ll. 1535, 1536. But I wish to reserve my judgment as I confess that the explication of them is not at all clear to me.

Marlowe had read about S. Peters and even about a hog in ch. XXII of the E. F. B, (Thoms p. 226) but I do not see any connection with this passage.

l. 915. (VII, 96). Friar Sandelo.

This friar is not mentioned in the German F. B. nor in the English prose-text either. But what is worse, he has not been mentioned before in our text! Wagner's supposition that he is here probably introduced merely „ioci causa", whatever Wagner may mean by this, does not help us much. Prof. Wagner proceeds: „We should suppose *friar Sandelo* to be one of the party who receives a blow from Faustus or Mephistophilis while about his own business." This is of course quite true, but the one necessary and almost inevitable conclusion from his own argument, Wagner does not draw. And this is that some lines have disappeared from our text, containing this incident, for on this supposition only could the words have any meaning.

In this connection I would call attention to the curious circumstance that in l. 917 we have the present tense *disturbeth* (as in the B-texts!) as against a past tense in all the parallel passages; see *stole* (l. 910), *strooke* (l. 913), *tooke* (l. 915) and *tooke* (l. 919). This may perhaps tend to confirm the impression that a

few lines were left out. If so, *tooke* of l. 915, and *disturbeth* of l. 917 cannot refer to the same incident, owing to the difference in tense. Friar Sandelo must have been struck before and Faust, invisible, must be supposed to attempt disturbing the excommunication after l. 916. Perhaps he and Mephistophiles, here already, begin beating the Friars and flinging fire-works among them, — see the stagedirection after l. 920. Or is it impossible that those who take part in this excommunication (see note to l. 894) should include in it one who has only just committed an act deserving this punishment?

See the note to l. 894. The passage omitted would, I suppose, contain at least the real Dirge and the Sandelo-incident.

l. 935. (Chorus, l. 14). Carolus the fift, at whose pallace now,
Faustus is feasted.

The one word *now* in this line proves that the Chorus is here out of place. It must of course have been followed immediately by the scene at the Emperor's palace *i. e.* scene X. (Breymann p. 118 seq.) The 1616-text shows us what to do with the intervening scenes VIII and IX. Why should they not have stood originally in the A-texts, where one of them is now found in the B-text, *i. e.* before scene VII? This question is of course entirely independent from the one to be touched on presently (see note on l.l. 939-1030) whether they are Marlowian or not.

B. l. 749 seqq. Scene VII. (A 939 seqq. Scene VIII).

This scene corresponds *mutatis mutandis* to scene VIII of the A-text, cf. Breymann's ed. p. 106 seqq., and my note to B 783 (A 964).

ll. 939-1030. (scenes VIII and IX).

Wagner is so certain that these two scenes [1]) are not by Marlowe that he does not even print them in his text, but only in his critical commentary. See his Introd. p. XXIX and his text p. p. 75-77. It must be that the buffoonery-element has again be too much for him. As usual, we get no argument at all.

There is one part in this scene which looks undoubtedly suspicious, *viz.* ll. 1007-1030. Mr. Fleay has made a very strong point concerning these lines. His conclusion is that, as ‚we have here an instance of double endings of scenes', alterations must have been introduced. (Ward p. 186). Still I hope that the following discussion, rather a lengthy one I am afraid, will make it clear that we have no certainty even here. It will be seen that there are very many doubtful elements in the debate. I do not pretend to conclude it on this point, any more than generally in this little book, but think that the quarrel will be thought to be still *sub judice.*

I must begin by remarking that the difficulty is nót solved, as some commentators and editors seem to think, by throwing out the two lines

Vanish vilaines, th' one like an Ape, an other like a Beare
The third an Asse, for doing this enterprise

found in the A-texts (nót in the B-texts) after A. l. 1013. If we throw these out, we must also remove the preceding lines 1007-1013 inclusive; there can be no doubt that they are too closely connected to separate them, for Mephistophiles comes in and finds Ralfe, Robin and the Vintner. To these *three* only, can the two

[1]) Which he wrongly looks upon as one. Cf. his words p. 75, and Ward p. 185, note, who quotes Dyce to the effect that a scene must be wanting between scene VIII and scene IX, so that there would be three!

rejected lines with their *Ape*, *Beare* and *Asse* refer. We must therefore necessarily suppose the Vintner to have remained on the stage until Mephistophiles hurls his threat at those three. If therefore there is an interpolation of a different scene-ending at all, it is either l.l. 1014-1030; and then l.l. 1007-1030 *with* the two lines that every editor relegates to the critical commentary are genuine or *vice versa*.

It will be noticed that we have twice: Enter Mephistophiles, which savours very much indeed of the interpolation, and it does not help us to change the second ‚*Enter*.... *Mephist*'. into ‚Re-enter M.', as Ward does tacitly, for this does not explain *why* Mephistophiles goes out and comes in again immediately after.

When, in the B-text, Faustus charms the clowns dumb, in order to please the Duke and Duchess of Vanholt, we find a certain Dick saying *to Faustus*: ‚Do you remember how your made me weare an Apes' — and ‚a clown' says: Ha' you forgotten me? you think to carry it away with your *Hey-passe* and *Re-passe*: do you remember the dogs fa'—and is in his turn silenced by being stricken dumb. (B. l.l. 1734-1738). Now, any one who will compare the various scenes, in which these clowns occur, will see that *Dick* has in the B-text itself taken the place of Robin (cf. *e. g.* B. l. 1167 and l. 1733) and that the *clown* mentioned is meant for Ralfe. This scene (in B.), whoever may be its author, must therefore have been written with reference to one of the two following passages in the A-text: either l.l. 1007-1013 (with the two additional lines) or l.l. 1014-1031. And if so, we have only to remember that in the strikingdumb-scene in the B-text, the *beare* and the *asse* (of the two rejected lines) do not occur, to come to the conclusion that B. l.l. 1733-1734 must be a reflexion of A. l.l. 1014-1031, and not of the preceding group. All

the more reason, it would seem, to reject [1]) those in a lump, along with the two others, that have never yet been admitted. So it would seem indeed, unless we find a plausible *raison d'être* for them. Seeing that in B. l. 1733 Dick says that *Faustus* made him wear an Apes face [2]) (cf. ib. *you)*, I was first inclined to suggest that after l. 1006, Faustus should come in ‚setting squibs at their backs' and that only afterwards ‚Enter(s) to them Mephastophilis'. This, as was pointed out to me, derives a certain degree of plausibility from the fact that Robin says (A. l. 1012 seq. cf. A. l. 940): ‚Ile neuer rob thy Library more'. That Robin addresses the person that has just come in (*i. e.* Faustus on this supposition) as Good diuel, just as he reports in the B-text l. 1610 seq. ‚one of (Faustus') deuils turn'd me into the likenesse of an Apes face', seems an objection. Could it be explained on the supposition that Faustus had dressed up as a devil? It is true that in B. l. 1734 Dick says it was Faustus who did it. Or could it be that Faustus, having done some conjuring tricks — such as might be expected of a devil — should hence be called a devil here? Good would be a *captatio benevolentiae.* There is too much apparent contradiction here to allow us thus to come to anything like a certain conclusion, — there seems fortunately another way out of the difficulty.

I do not know what particular reason commentators had and have for reading Belseborams in the piece of nonsensical Latin, (l. 1005) which is supposed to conjure up the devils, instead of Beljeborams of the first

[1]) I must moreover call attention to the circumstance that in l.l. 1008-1113 the clowns are afraid, whereas in l. 1020 seqq., they bravely make fun of Mephistophiles.

[2]) But I see now that this may be a reminiscence (with the author of B.) of the E. F. B. See Thoms III, p. 261, ch. XXXVII.

Quarto. But considering that in the B-text two devils are conjured up (Belcher and Mephistophiles, whereas only the latter appears) and that in the A-text we have practically two appearances of a devil (whether twice the same or two different ones, is the very question under consideration), I cannot help thinking that in line 1005 we have to read Belsabub (who has already been invoked by Robin in this scene; l. 999), that therefore after l. 1006 Belsabub appears and that Mephistophiles ‚enter(s) to them' later on; and that moreover originally in the B-text Belcher, (taking the place of Belsabub) also appeared.

l. 943. *(omitted by Ward)* Starke naked.

Kellner, Zur Sprache Christopher Marlowe's (1887) § 1, finds it in Tamburlaine and Ovid's Elegies, and has not noticed this passage. (As he quotes Breymann's edition, he could have seen it.) It occurs twice in The Second Report of Dr. Faustus, Thoms III, p. p. 382, 383.

l. 955 seq. Yes, my maister and mistris shal finde that I can reade, he for his forehead, she for her priuate study, shee's borne to beare with me, or else my Art failes.

A reference to l.l. 1095, 1109 etc. will show at once that Robin is thinking of the horns as an ornament for his master's forehead and of the opprobium attached to it. See the B-text l. 767 where it is more clearly expressed. ‚She for her priuate study' cannot but be taken loosely here = ‚she will find it out privately' *i. e.* no one will be by; ‚Shee's borne to beare with me' has of course a double meaning. First of all simply: she is to bear with me. Compare for this use to be borne to do a thing = to have to do it), the well-known passage in Hamlet: The world is out of joint, O cursed spite that I was born to set it right (where Hamlet does not refer

to his being born only in order to do it, so much as to the regret that he has to do it now.) Secondly, in our passage, to beare with me contains an obscene reference to his hoped-for relations with his Mistress. See the B-texts l.l. 769-775.

A similar play upon words *(carry* instead of *bear)* is found twice in Ben Jonson's comedies, cf. Jonson ed. Cunningham II, 173, 368. Neither use is mentioned in the N. E. D., — no doubt because most Edd. leave out passages which are thought objectionable from the point of view of morals, — and perhaps Dr. Murray's readers prefer these *editiones in usum* infantium.

B. l. 783. (A. 964). Whippincrust.

Wagner ingeniously suggests it may be a kind of ‚pie crust' which contained eggs beaten or ‚whipt' into it or „even a drink containing ‚whipt' eggs and bread". (p. 121) An other attempt at an explanation of this word is found in Van de Velde's translation who renders it by *Prügelruster* (p. 77) which he justifies thus: As *whippincrust* is a word whose signification is not found in any dictionary he has rendered in his translation the word *whip* which he seemed to recognise in it, and ‚which probably forms the stem for the first part of the compound.' If Van de Velde and the other commentators had only compared this passage where all these different wines are mentioned with the corresponding passage in the A-text, they would have found there (l. 964, VIII, 21 seq.): „I can make thee druncke with *ipocrase*" etc., and it would have been clear at once that *Whippincrust* is nothing but a clown's jocose attempt at rendering *ipocrase*.

This drink for which Ward p. 184 gives the recipe is also found mentioned in Miss Lee's ed. of Narcissus, p. 31. See ib. (and cf. p. 50) a reference (with note) for

the word *muskadine* which occurs in l. 782 of our B-text.

The culinarily inclined among my readers will possibly be interested to hear that in Holland a similar mixture, called *hepocras* (written: hypocrás) is still often given at the ‚reception' (usually on the Sunday before the nuptial day) without which no Dutch wedding is complete. There is r e d h y p o c r a s in which claret is the main ingredient and w h i t e h y p o c r a s for which hock is used instead. It is also called *bride's tears*, a name invented, I suppose, to induce the guests to take much of it, for what can be kinder than to make a bride's tears disappear?

l. 979. (IX, 2) ecce signum.

See for an other usage of this phrase = here's the proof bearing out my statement, the reference (by Ward) to Falstaff's phrase in 1 H. IV II, 4, 187. That *ecce* was quite a well-known, popular word so that we cannot wonder at these latin words being used by clowns, is evident from the derivative *ecceity* for which the N. E. D. gives a reference as early as 1549.

cf. Taming of a Shrew ed. Morley p. 157 (*ante* note to l. 356).

l. 983. (IX, 7). Hush, Ile gul him supernaturally: Drawer, I hope al is paid *etc.*

‚There is an inconsistency here; the Vintner cannot properly be addressed as ‚Drawer'. So Dyce has it and Ward (p. 116) also thinks the way of addressing our friend is ‚improper', but gives us at the same time an alternative: „if there be not some confusion in the passage, which is different in the quarto of 1616". This view is very seductive. If we find that the B-texts really speak in the corresponding passage of the ‚Winters boy' *i. e.* the Drawer, and consider that a drawer may very well be addressed, say for politeness' sake, as

a vintner whereas the reverse process is objected to, then it becomes very tempting to suggest that the original personage was the Drawer as in B, and not the Vintner as in A. But we meet at once with the objection, fatal I am afraid to the hypothesis, that in l. 982, when the personage under scrutiny is coming in (*i. e.* when he does not hear them yet, so that there would be no reason for assuming that he must be spoken of as a different man to what he really is!) Ralfe says: But Robin, here comes the vintner.

I do not think it impossible that, far from there being here anything ‚inconsistent' or ‚improper', the word *Drawer* should have been used advisedly. Why should not this ‚degradation' stand as part of Robin's announced ‚gulling', although we may not now think this very ‚supernatural'? It is quite natural that, having used this epithet once more (l. 996) Robin should revert to ‚Vintner' as an address later on and that Ralfe in his distress should also call the man by his right denomination (l.l. 1003, 1010).

l. 988. (IX, 12). and you are but a etc.

See l. 1006, below; The Wise-Woman of Hogsdon I, 1. (Mermaid-ed. p. 257: *Young Chart.* That she hath as other women have; that she goes for a maid, as others do, *etc.)* and Greene's James the Fourth, I, 2, 63 and I, 3, 75 (Manly's Preshaksperean Drama II, 345, 350).

Etc. was therefore the sign that actors might give free play to their imagination and introduce ‚business' *i. e.* ‚gag'.

B. ll. 1182 seq.q. (A. 1030 seq.q.)

It will be seen on looking into Breymann's parallel-edition that from this line down to B. l. 1496 the B-texts are quite different from the A-texts, and the reason of this becomes clear on a comparison of Scene

X in the two texts, — it is the introduction of the Bruno-episode, which was the cause. From the nature of the case this statement is not susceptible of anything like proof, — I can only ask my readers to read through these scenes and I have no doubt that it will become apparent.

I think I may say that the general consensus of opinion claims at least these scenes as non-Marlowian, — they constitute rather an important addition, Messrs Bird and Rowley received a rather important sum for their ‚adicyones' [1]) (four pounds) and so we conclude that these scenes were the work of those two gentlemen. Although something — very little — may seem to point the other way [2]), there seems to me to be no reason for rejecting this conclusion.

It is interesting to point out that Messrs. Bird and Rowley (or those who are responsible for the scenes found in B. only) have had recourse to the E. F. B. too. See the notes to B, ll. 1199, 1317, 1361, 1398, 1464, etc. etc.

B. l. 1199 (A. 1030). Benvolio asleep.

See Thoms III, 252.

ll. 1031 seqq. (X, 1 seqq.) [3])

	Thoms III, p. 249	Spiess-Braune p. 74
Emp. Maister doctor Faustus I haue heard strange report of thy knowledge in the blacke Arte, how that none in my Empire, nor in the	.... Faustus, I have heard much of thee, that thou art excellent in the black art and none like thee in my empire; for	(the emperor) „hielte jm für, wie jhm bewust, das er ein erfahrner der schwartzen Kunst were,

[1]) cf. Ward, Introd. p. CV.

[2]) See the note to B. 1436.

[3]) I may be pardoned for deviating here and in the note to l. 1050 from my usual arrangement, so as to better bring out the points of resemblance between these longer passages.

	Thoms III, 249.	Spiess p. 47
whole world [,] can compare with thee for the rare effects of Magicke: they say thou hast a familiar spirit, by whome thou canst accomplish what thou list[.] This therefore is my request, that thou let me see some proofe of thy skil, that mine eies may be witnesses to confirme what mine eares haue heard reported, and here I sweare to thee, by the honor of mine Imperial crowne, that what euer thou doest, thou shalt be no wayes preiudiced or indamaged.	men say that thou hast a familiar spirit with thee, and that thou canst do what thou list: it is therefore .... my request of thee that thou let me see proof of thy experience, and I vow unto thee by the honour of my imperial crown, none evil shal happen unto thee for so doing.	vnnd einen Warsager Geist hette, were derhalben sein begern, dass er jn ein Prob sehen lassen wolt, es solte jhm nichts widerfahren, das verhiesse er bey seiner Keyserlichen Kron.(The Wolfenb. M.S. is even more concise.)

See the conclusion of the note to l.l. 1050 seqq.

l. 1043 (X, 11). ' *Knight*, I' faith *etc.*

It will be noticed on a comparison with the E. F. B. how skilfully Marlowe has here interwoven the matter contained in two chapters of the E. F. B., which incidents are there (E. F. B. chs. 29 and 30) entirely independent of each other.

The knight has no name in the A-texts, Marlowe here follows his source, the E. F. B. (Thoms III, p. 252), where we read that ‚the person shall be nameless', but an exquisite joke is found in the German texts for although both say that they do not care to men-

tion his name, the Wolfenbüttel MS. (p. 78) adds in brackets: (fuit der Herr von Hardeck) and Spiess has in the margin: Erat baro ab Hardeck. (p. 76).

I do not know of any special reason why Messrs. Bird and Rowley gave to this ‚person' the name Benvolio.

ll. 1050 seq.q. (X, 17 seq.q.)

	Thoms III, 249.	Spiess p. 74
Emp. Then doctor Faustus, marke what I shall say. As I was sometime solitary set Within my Closet,	Well, hear then what I say,.. being once solitary in my house,	Nun so höre mich ... dass ich auff ein zeit in meinem
sundry thoughts arose About the honour of mine auncestors,	I called to mind my elders and ancestors,	Läger in Gedancken gestanden,
Howe they had wonne prowesse such exploits, Gote such riches, subdued so many kingdomes. As we that do succeede or they that shal Hereafter possesse our throne, shal (I feare me) neuer attaine to that degree of high renowne and great authoritie,	how it was possible for them to attain to so great a degree and authority, yea, so high, that we the successors of that line' (see *infra*) ‚are not able to come near.	wie vor mir meine Voreltern vnd Vorfahren in so hohen Grad und Authoritet gestiegen gewesen, dann ich vnd meine Nachkommene noch entspringen möchten,
Amongest which kings is Alexander the great, Chiefe spectacle of the worldes preeminence. The bright	As for example: the great and mighty monarch of the world Alexander Magnus, was such a pattern and spec-	vnd sonderlich dass in aller Monarchey der grossmächtige Keyser Allexander Magnus, ein Lucern und Zierd aller Key-

shining of whose glorious actes Lightens the world with his reflecting beames,

As when I heare but motion [1]) made of him, It grieues my soule I never saw the man:

If therefore thou, by cunning of thine Art, Canst raise this man from hollow vaults below, Where lies intombde this famous Conquerour. And bring with him his beauteous Paramour, Both

in their right shapes, gesture, and attire They vsde to weare during their time of life,

Thoms III, 249.

tacle to all his successors,

as the chronicles make mention of, having so great riches, conquering and subduing so many kingdoms, the which I and those that follow me (I fear) shal never be able to attain unto: (see *supra)*

wherefore Faustus my hearty desire is, that thou wouldst vouchsafe to let me see that Alexander and his Paramour, the

which was praised to be so fair: and I pray thee shew me them in such sort, that I may see their personages, shapes, gesture and apparel, as they used in their lifetime, and that here before my face,

Spiess p. 74

ser,

wie auss den Chronicken zu befinden, grosse Reichthumb, viel Königreich vnd Herrschafften vnter sich gebracht, welches mir vnd meinen Nachkommen wider zu wegen zu bringen schwer fallen wirdt.

Demnach ist mein gnediges begern, mir sein Alexanders vnd seiner Gemählin Form, Gestalt, Gang, Geberde

wie sie im Leben gewesen, für zustellen, damit ich

[1]) Cf. note to l. 1064.

Thou shalt both satisfie my iust desire, And giue me cause to praise thee whilst I liue.	Thoms III, 250. to that end that I may say, I have my long desire fulfilled, and to praise thee to be a famous man in thy art and experience.	Spiess p. 74 spüren möge, dass du ein erfahrner Meister in deiner Kunst seyest.

It will be noticed that the resemblance in this long passage is less close than in the immediately preceding one. If we enquire into the cause, there is one which suggests itself at once, *viz.* that here we have poetry as against prose in the former.

And this is very important, for as we cannot suppose l.l. 1031 seq.q. to have been freely versified first, by Marlowe and afterwards rewritten and closely modelled by him (1) on the prose text, we must conclude that l.l. 1031 seq.q. are from the hand of Marlowe as they stand. So Marlowe did write prose.

l. 1064 (X, 31). As when I heare but motion made of him.

Ward, comparing Friar Bacon II, 165; V, 16, explains *motion* here = *mention,* but there it means, as he himself acknowledges, *proposal* in which sense it is admittedly often found in Shakespeare. I strongly suspect that we must read *mention*, (*mêtion* misread as *motion ?)* for a *proposal* is not a *mention!* This view is rendered more plausible still by comparing Marlowe's source: „Alexander Magnus . . . as the chronicles make *mention* of . . . ." (Thoms III, 249, 250).

l. 1069. (X, 36). his beauteous Paramour.

Prof. Ward remarks that the word ‚Paramour' corresponds to the ‚*Gemählin*' (consort) of the Faustbuch. This is true. The E. F. B. has paramour (Thoms III, p. 273).

(1) Or by someone else, for the matter of that!

so the probabilities are that it was here used = wife, not = the person who, on the authority of Flute, is — ‚God bless us! — a thing of nought'. However as the word must have been known to Marlowe in these two senses, he may have taken the ‚paramour' which he found in his source as meaning either the one or the other and the ultimate reference to Spiess' *Gemählin* does not help us much. Alexander married Roxana long after he had enjoyed favour at the hands of others. Thais, one of his ‚friends', a well-known Athenian (who married one of his successors, Ptolemæus Lagi) may have been better known to Marlowe than Roxana.

I. 1085. (X, 52)

Shal appeare before your grace in that manner that they [both] [1]) liu'd in, in their most florishing estate, which I doubt not shall sufficiently content your Imperiall maiesty.

In Thoms III, 250 we read: shall appear unto you in manner and form as they both lived in their most flourishing time; and herewith I hope to please your Imperial Majesty.

Spiess has (p. 75): die können solche Form unnd Gestalt an sich nemen, vnd sich darein verwandelen, durch die selbige wil ich jr May. Alexandrum warhafftig sehen lassen.

B. l. 1283 (A. 1093).

I'le be Acteon and turne myself to a stagge.

This reading shows less familiarity with the Actæon legend than that of A. l. 1093: I faith thats as true as *Diana turnd me* to a stag. We naturally conclude that the writer of the B-text knew of it at second hand only and that his source of information was the A-text which he ‚freely' reproduced.

[1]) Dyce's conjecture both is born out by the E. F. B.

l. 1095 seq. (X, 62). he left the hornes for you.

This is of course an allusion to l. 1111, but in Prof. Ward's text and Wagners, this latter passage which alone explains the former is omitted, — *verecundiae causa!* And yet Ward says (p. CIX) that he has reprinted the A-text *in full!* He should at least here, as in so many other cases, have mentioned the omission, or not pretend to give an unexpurgated text. The babies for whom such editions are intended must indeed be terribly moral, — or indeed very frail if it is deemed necessary to remove such stumbling-blocks to morality as these! Consider the force of resistance imputed to a ‚student of Shakespeare' who has a ‚bastard hope' changed into a ‚base hope' for him! (Clar. Press. ed. of the Merchant of Venice, p. 51).

See Paul Hentzner's travels (ed. Morley, Nat. Library, 165) p. 46, besides Nares *in v.v.* Hornfair and Cuckold's Point.

B. l. 1285 (A. 1099). The dumb show.

The italics following line 1285 are usually regarded as being the description of this dumbshow, but it is worth while to remark that evidently two stage-directions have been amalgamated.

„*Senit. Enter at one [dore] the Emperour Alexander at the other Darius; they meete, Darius is throwne downe, Alexander kils him; takes off his Crowne, and offering to goe out, his Paramour meetes him, he embraceth her, and sets Darius Crowne vpon her head; and coming backe, both salute the Emperour*" being one, and what follows is of course stagedirection for the main play; „*who (i. e.* the Emperor) „*leauing* [1]) *his State, offers to embrace them*", (*i. e.* Alexander and his Paramour) „*which Faustus seeing, suddenly staies him*".

[1]) *Dele* the comma after leauing in Breymann's edition.

We read after this: „*Then trumpets cease, and Musicke sounds*" which may be meant for part of the dumbshow or of the stagedirection for the play.

The first part of the Dumbshow which has reference to Darius has nothing like it in the prose texts; the incident of the Emperor who wishes to embrace Alexander and Roxana will be found in Thoms III, p. 251 which passage also contains the meeting of Alexander and his Paramour.

The middle part, *i. e.* the stagedirection to the main play, and the two lines in B (1286, 1287) which follow:

> My gracious Lord, you doe forget your selfe
> These are but shadowes, not substantiall

for which there is no exact equivalent in the A-texts, (for it will be noticed that in A. l.l. 1103 seq.q. the situation is different!) is a faithful reproduction of the E. F. B.: „whereat the Emperor Carolus would have stood up to receive and greet him with the like reverence: Faustus took hold on him, and would not permit him to do it."

B. l. 1317. (A. 1109). O zounds my head.

Benvolio hurts his head against the window, — cf. B. l. 1226 and for the incident Thoms III p. 252: „And as the knight awaked thinking to pull in his head he hit his horns against the glass that the panes thereof flew about his ears" etc.

B. l. 1335. (after A. 1120). Ho, Belimote, Argiron, Asterote.

These *hounds raised* (cf. l. 1332) by Faustus evidently come in the shape of devils, — see l.l. 1440, 1446. On the name Belimot cf. Kellner, Beilage zur allgemeinen (Augsburger *i. e.* Münchener) Zeitung 1887, N°. 346, p. 5107.

B. l. 1353. (after A. 1133) ruffes.

Cf. *ante* note to l. 224.

B. l.l. 1361 seq.q. (after A. 1133) Scenes X*a*. X*b*.

See chapter XXXI (How the above mentioned Knight went about to be revenged of Dr. Faustus) and ch. LII (How Dr. Faustus gathered together a great Army of Men in his extremity against a Knight that would have conjured him on his own Iourney).

B. l l. 1398 seq.q. (after A. 1133)
The false-head episode in scene X*a*.

It may have been suggested by ch. XLVII (How four Jugglers cut one anothers Heads off, and set them on again and Faustus deceived them) but not necessarily so.

B. l. 1436. (after A. 1133).
Or hew'd this flesh and bones as small as sand.

This line is compared by all commentators with one in the old ‚Taming of a shrew': ‚And hew'd thee smaller than the Libian sandes'. [1]) I must begin by remarking that I see no absolute necessity for assuming that the one line múst be imitated from the other. It is true that we have in either line, the unusual collocation of ‚hewing' and ‚sand', but there the likeness ends. Still, it will be prudent to assume, for the sake of argument, that a dependency exists.

Ward says (p. LXIV) of this line that if it be „imitated from the old Taming of a shrew (which was entered in the Stationers' Registers in 1594, and had very probably been produced on the stage before August 23rd. 1589),

[1]) The context is:

I sweare ....
Had I but known ere thou hadst wedded her,
Were in my brest the worlds immortall soule,
This angrie sword should rip thy hatefull chest,
And hewd thee smaller then the Libian sandes.

The second line seems corrupt; but *quid?* Read *had rip't* in l. 3, ór *hew* in l. 4. –

this would indicate that Marlowe's play had received additions from some other hand; for the line occurs in a scene which was certainly not by Marlowe". Surely if this be so, „there needs no additional argument come from this line to tell us so," but let that pass.

If it were imitated from the Taming of a shrew, this imitation might have taken place at any time before 1616 when the line is first found printed and it is difficult to see what it would prove with regard to additions in Marlowe's text. It is possible that Ward's imitated from is a misprint for imitated in — Dyce, indeed, whom Ward quotes, says it is imitated in the Taming of a shrew. Then there would be a beautiful concursus of opinions anent this line, for not only do we find Bullen express the same opinion, (Introd. p. XXX) but it will be seen *supra* note to l. 356 p. 47, that it could hardly be otherwise. And now matters assume a different aspect: If the anonymous author of *A shrew* imitated this scene, (or a line of it) it must have existed and so it formed part of the play of Dr. Faustus as it stood in 1589. This would point to Marlowe's authorship of this scene. [1]) I am the first however to admit that the considerations advanced are not sufficient to allow of this conclusion, for as I have said before, I do not see the necessity for assuming any dependency at all.

The same must be said of a remark of Bullen's, — see his Introduction p. XXX note — where he suggests that

[1]) On the assumption of the misprint in Ward, we understand his words about the scene ‚which was certainly not by Marlowe'. He refers to Fleay's hypothesis that Decker wrote the greater part of Marlowe's Faust. (Appendix A in Ward's ed. p. CXXXVIII seq.q.) As this hypothesis is based on no facts (see p. CXLI) but only on Fleay's belief and irritating, unsupported suppositions, we may safely leave it to stand over for discussion until something like proof of it shall have been advanced.

Shakespeare, when writing the well-known passage in the Merry Wives of Windsor (so soon as I came beyond Eton they threw me off from behind one of them, in a slough of mire; and set spurs and away, like three German devils, three Doctor Faustuses; IV, 5, 68 seqq.) was ‚glancing at the play', although ‚the reference may be to the prose tract'. Neither in the E. F. B. (see ch. LII, Thoms p. 283) nor in this scene do I find any *trait* resembling the situation that Bardolph speaks of. There are, on the contrary, mány souldiers mentioned in the play as well as in the prose tracts, and there is no talk of three incarnations of Faustus at all.

B. l. 1447 (after A. 1133).

And hurle him in some lake of mud and dirt

See the note to B. l. 1436.

B. l. 1464. these Trees remove at my command

This incident recalls not only — slightly, it is true — the moving wood in Macbeth, but also and more especially ch. XXXI of the E. F. B., — cf. Thoms, III. 253: „suddenly all the bushes were turn'd into horsemen, which also ran to encounter with the knight and his company."

l. 1134. Stagedirection (sc. XI).

A green; afterwards the house of Faustus.

Edd. all agree in substance that a new scene should begin here and they have all adopted, if not the same stage-direction, at least the suggestion of Dyce's: „Here the scene is supposed to be changed to the *fair and pleasant green* which Faustus presently mentions". Prof. Ward adds, even: „The representation of Faustus's journey on the stage" (the spacing is mine) „recalls the ambulatory scenes of the Indian drama."

There can be no doubt that a break is required. But the assumption that this new scene plays on a green is not unobjectionable. As Faustus afterwards falls asleep in his chair, (l. 1181 *i. e.* XI, l. 44) Edd. suppose the scene to change again from the green to his room in his home at Wittenberg. All this will unfortunately not do, — because it is a far-fetched solution, and, as will be observed, one without an analogue in English Dramatic Literature (or Prof. Ward, its historiographer, would not quote as the only analogue an Indian one!) The solution is moreover unnecessary, for an easier one can be found.

From l. 1140 — will you go on horsebacke, or on foote? — it appears, clearly enough, I should think, that they have not yet set out on their journey. From l. 1139, where Faustus has expressed his desire to ‚*make haste to* Wertenberge', we see that he was not at Wittenberg itself in his house. As they have not yet begun their journey, they may already *a priori* be supposed to be in or near a house. There are several circumstances which go to confirm this supposition. The whole context — if it be not systematically misinterpreted, — tends to make us expect that the Horsecourser finds him in the *very* place where Faustus has had his conversation with Mephastophilis; it is only the apparent impossibility to explain ‚*this . . . . . greene*', that caused Dyce to submit his explanation. Now, l. 1181 with its stagedirection (which we have no reason to think wrong) shows that he is in a house, as he sits down in a chair, which we cannot by any stretch of imagination look upon as a natural produce of greens, however pleasant these may be. So: Faust's conversation takes place in or near a house. Remember that in the B-texts the horsecourser, when telling his adventure, says: ‚I went me home to his house,

and there I found him asleepe.' Moreover Marlowe must have remembered having found more than once in his English source that Faustus was in the habit of playing little practical jokes, not in his own house always but at inns, — cf. *e.g.* chap. 37 ‚How Dr. Faustus served the drunken Clowns' (Thoms III, p. 261) for which purpose he ‚went into an inn', (ib.) And in chap. 34 we actually find that this trick with the straw-horse took place ‚at a fair called Pheifering' (ib. 259), and when the horse-courser looks Faustus up again ‚he went angerly to his inn.' (Spiess, p. 83: ‚Der Kauffer wuste noch wohl wo sein verkauffer *zur Herberg* lage' is even clearer).

Finally, we can imagine Dr. Faustus — who has only to command his ‚familiar spirit' to do a certain thing and hey, presto! there you are, — to have at once reached Wittenberg but the horse-courser would naturally look for him where he found him — and we have seen that this would nót be at Wittenberg — and *he* could not conjure himself over to Wittenberg in a trice as Faustus might have done.

Conclusion: When writing this scene Marlowe was thinking of a place in or near an inn (*e. g.* at Pfeifering) at some distance from Wittenberg. And now everything becomes clear. The conversation takes place say at the window [1]) or before the door of that inn and Faustus *points to* that green which he describes as looking so fair. This is a situation which even now (with our elaborate stage-machinery) would not cause the slightest difficulty, and which we may very well suppose Marlowe to have had before his mind's eye, considering what he found in his source.

Another solution will possibly suggest itself to my

[1]) Cf. note on l. 1203 *infra*.

readers, as it did to me. Considering that the obnoxious stagedirection *Sleepe in his chaire* is the cause of all our difficulties one might be excused for having recourse to the convenient process — in matters philological — of simply rejecting as not genuine what one cannot explain, and read with the B-text: ‚He sits to sleepe' assuming Faustus to sit down *on the green*, where then the *whole* scene might be supposed to be enacted. But this would presuppose the worthy pair to have already set out on their journey and we have seen that this is not accurate.

l. 1137. (XI, 4.) my latest yeares

This use of *latest* where we should now say *last* is very common in Shakespeare, cf. *e. g.* A. Schmidt, Shakespeare Lexicon, I p. 629, a: *at the latest minute of the hour; the very latest counsel that ever I shall breathe; the latest parle we admit*, etc. etc.

l. 1149. (XI, 15.) dollars

Thoms p. 259: forty dollars; Spiess p. 83: 40 Fl.

l. 1155. (XI, 21.)
he has a great charge, neither wife nor childe.

This (unobserved?) instance of the author's humour — which, distantly enough it is true, but still to some extent, reminds us of Mephistophiles' kinship with the ‚Geist, der stets verneint', *i. e.* the man who has always a different view on matters from every body else! — is looked upon by Wagner (p. 128) as „a foolish joke"!

l. 1166. (XI, 30) made man

See Ward's note, and S. Rowley's When you see me you know me, 1605 (Bodl. Libr. Mal. 829): and thow 't bee a mayd-man by it. (C. 3. r°.)

l. 1167. (XI, 31.) Ile not leave my horse for fortie.

„‚Twice forty' and ‚forty more' have been here suggested as emendations by Dyce and Wagner". Thus runs Prof. Ward's apparently approving note, and there can be no doubt that this is the sense intended. To obtain that sense, it is however not necessary to change anything. Everything becomes quite clear when in reading we stress *leave*, as opposed to the implied: ‚I have gót it' (for forty). ‚But I won't leave it at that price', then follows quite naturally.

l. 1183. (XI, 46.)

mas, Doctor Lopus was neuer such a Doctor

This is the line on which most stress has been laid to prove that already before 1594 the A-text must have undergone alterations, must have received additions. Of these the present line is supposed to be the most palpable one since, as Dyce (p. XXI of the one-volume edition) says, „Marlowe died in 1593; and the said Doctor Lopez did not start into notoriety till the following year, during which he suffered death at Tyburn for his treasonable practices." There can be no doubt that if it is true that Dr. Lopez did not ‚start into notoriety' until 1594, Marlowe can not possibly be credited with the incriminated passage. Dyce and Wagner are to be excused for not knowing better, although an investigation into the career of this medical man would have revealed the unstableness of the foundation their argument was built upon. It was an extract from Mr. S. L. Lee's article in the February number of the Gentleman's Magazine for 1880, given by Dr. Furness on p. 395 of his splendid Variorum Edition of the Merchant of Venice, that proved to me, with all certainty required, that Marlowe can very well have written the passage in question. One or two sentences from

the extract quoted will suffice to establish my point. Dr. Lopez (born it is supposed ± 1525) „probably obtained his medical education (as was the usual custom) at some Southern University. But he returned to England comparatively early in life, and joined the recently formed College of Physicians. He rapidly gained in reputation in his ‚faculty'. In 1569 he was selected to read the Anatomy Lectures of the year, and in 1575 his name appears almost at the head of the list of the chief doctors of London, quoted by Stowe ..... Lopez, who numbered among his patients the chief statesmen of the day, was for a long time attached to the household of Lord Leicester"..... who „frequently summoned to Kenilworth a number of actors" etc. etc. In 1586 (there's virtue in figures!) he ‚became sworn physician to Queen Elizabeth. The promotion gave him new prominence in political society.' Would any one like to maintain after this, that in 1588 Marlowe *could* not have written of Dr. ‚Lopus' as a renowned physician as he, Lopez, ‚did not start into notoriety until 1594'? (Let us remember that Shakespeare speaks of ‚notorious goodness' and therefore not quibble on ‚notoriety.') Surely, Ward in his second and third editions, and Bullen should not have unblushingly repeated the objection. If my critical reader should object to ‚Mas Doctor Lopus *was* neuer such a Doctor', saying that *was* points to some time after 1594 when the man ‚was' no more, and if he should not dare to defend it on the plea that ‚was never' means ‚was not at all hitherto' — which I do not consider a very plausible argument — we come to the conclusion that Marlowe had actually written: mas, Doctor Lopus is not such a Doctor, and that in the edition of 1604 the is not got changed into was never.

ll. 1191 seq. (XI, 53 seq.)

Delius (p. 19) thinks this passage is closer to the E. F. B. (Thoms p. 259) than to the G. F. B. (Spiess p. 83). The passage is however only of secondary importance.

ll. 1196 seq. (XI, 57).

> O yonder is his snipper snapper, do you heare? you hey-passe where's your maister?

The whole of this scene — which in a certain way may be said to centre in these lines — seems somewhat out of keeping with the rest in so much as it would better suit Wagner to have a conversation of this sort with the Horse-courser, than Mephistophiles who, be it remembered, had been ordered by Faustus always to appear in the habit of a Franciscan Friar. In the E. F. B. no one is by when the Horse-courser calls on Faustus for damages as we should now call it, — so it is Marlowe's own addition. Even the assumption of a new scene at l. 1181 (Enter Horse-courser all wet), where Faustus would then be discovered sleeping in his chair does not help us at all. Can anyone solve this difficulty, — without proposing to declare the scene spurious?

Ward might have added a reference to the B-text l. 1738 for the word *hey-passe*.

Whipper snapper is still found in the same sense; see *e. g.* Vanity Fair ch. XXXIV.

l. 1203 (XI, 63). Ile breake his glasse-windowes.

Wagner thinks glass-windows may be ‚eyes' and gravely — Ward kindly says: ingeniously — asks as an alternative if Faustus must perhaps be supposed to be wearing ‚spectacles'! (p. 129). Of course Ward is right: Faust is sitting near the *window* of his house!

In Ch. XXX we have some window-p a n e s flying about someone's ears. Did Marlowe remember this? He had read it not long before, — see note to l. 1043. And see my note to l. 1134, p. 106.

l. 1213 (XI, 74) Stage direction *Pull him by the legge* etc.

For the leg episode see ch. XXXIV (Thoms p. 259, 260) but also ch. XXXIII. See the note to B. 1536.

B. l. 1536. (A. 1215.)

O help, help, the villaine has murder'd me.

There is a striking similarity in expression here between this text and the E. F. B. which proves that Messrs. Bird and Rowley, who, as we have seen, consulted this text must have had it before them — just as Marlowe had it lying before him when he wrote — unless indeed we wish to assume that this passage was in A. cf. Thoms, III p. 260: „then began Dr. Faustus to cry with open throat, he hath murthered me."

That the Horse-courser wants to „cast his leg into some ditch or other", is a reminiscense of a passage in ch. XXXIII. See Thoms, III p. 259, „and with these words he cast the leg away from him into a ditch."

B. l. 1568. (after A. 1233.) Looke up into th' hall there, ho!

I would draw attention to this line which I do not understand. To whom are these words addressed?

B. l. 1576. (A. 1233.) Carter.

For this incident, see Thoms III, 260.

ll. 1234. seqq. (XII, 1 seqq.)

this merriment hath much pleased me.

A careful student of the play will of course ask: w h i c h merriment? and I should be very much astonished if, having studied the text of this scene in the

two quartos, he should content himself with the answer — which, it is true, necessarily suggests itself first — that this must refer either to a dumbshow which we may suppose to have gone before or to an imaginary entertainment which the Duke is speaking of, and which we must then assume him to have witnessed before entering on the stage. This stage-fiction is indeed of common occurrence in our times, but I am not so sure that we may count with it for the Elizabethan stage, when the curtain was not r a i s e d o n persons, sitting talking together who are overheard in the middle of a conversation. And with regard to the Dumbshow, we might well remark with astonishment that it had left no traces at all.

But there is more. It will be noticed that the author of the B-text, who generally in this scene follows A very closely (cf. *ante* note to ll. 939, seqq.) does not speak of a m e r r i m e n t but of s i g h t s (B. 1616, 1619, 1625) and that he thinks it moreover necessary to explain what he means by it; we have a reference in ll. 1618 seqq. to the ‚inchanted castle', about which we may read in B.'s source, the E. F. B. ch. XL. (How Dr. Faustus through his Charms, made a great Castle in the presence of the Duke of Anhalt.) This ‚Castle in the air' must indeed be *supposed* to have been conjured up before the Duke, and it is b e c a u s e it was not really done that B. makes his grace of Anhalt speak of it. All the more reason then to argue as follows: As, in the A-text, the Duke does nót mention any particular merriment — *i. e.* as there the text does nót bring the audience *au courant* of the situation, — we must conclude that the audience did not need it, *i. e.* that something else *viz.*: a real m e r r i m e n t had gone before.

And when we come to think of it, we have the ne-

cessary complement to this scene ready to hand, for not only has the investigation of ll. 939—1030 taught us that something like B. ll. 1731 seqq. may have originally formed part of the A-text, but in the original of this scene (ch. XXXVII: How Dr. Faustus served the drunken clowns), this scene is spoken of as a merry jest' (Thoms III p. 262), and, what is more, when the ‚rude disturbers' knock at the gate, Faustus prevails upon the Duke to admit them on the plea that ‚they are good subiect for a merriment' (B. 1672.) All this would therefore seem to point to the conclusion that something like what is now B. 1653—1747 was originally found at the beginning of this scene. And if it be asked: ‚Why puts the B-text that behind, the A-text puts before', I can only answer that I for one do not see any more reason than can be discovered for the problem: „Why says the Spaniard: Senhor Si, the Italian: Si signor?"!

The whole of this scene is again a close imitation of the E. F. B. See especially Ch. XXXIX: How Dr. Faustus played a merry Iest with the Duke of Anhalt in his Court (Thoms III p. 263). I quote some of the expressions of our text along with the corresponding ones of the English and German prose-texts (Spiess p. 85).

1234. merriment; merry Iest; Abendthewer.

1238. I haue heard that great bellied women do long for some dainties or other *etc.*; I have always heard that great bellied women do always long for some dainties *etc.*; ich hab alle zeit gehört, dasz die schwangere Weibsbilder zu mancherley dingen Lust und Begierdt haben, *etc.*

1242. I wil not hide from you the thing my heart desires; I will not hide from you what my heart doth

much desire; ich wils euch warlich nicht verhalten, was ich jetzunder wünschen möchte, *etc. etc.*

B. l. 1624. (A. 1237). gratious Lady.

As the A-text has *Madame*, and the E. F. B. *Gracious lady* in the corresponding passage (Thoms III p. 263), we must either look upon this as a proof that B. had again looked into the English prose-version, — see the preceding sections — or assume that the A-text too read originally: *Gratious lady*, which is far more likely.

l. 1238. (XII. 5). I haue heard that great bellied women do long for some dainties or other.

See Meas. f. Meas. II, 1, 91, and 101, where we have the ‚longing' for stewed prunes. Littlewit, in Jonson's Bartholomew Fair, turns this longing to account, to steal a visit to the Fair, cf. Jonson ed. Cunningham, II p.p. 156 and 181. See also *ib.* p. 161 and a note on p. 157. Montaigne derives an argument against petticoat-government from this circumstance. „It is dangerous to leave the dispensation of our succession unto their judgment" (of women) „according to the choyse they shall make of their children, which is most commonly unjust and fantasticall. For, the same unrulie appetite, and distasted relish, or strange longings which they have when they are great with child, the same have they at al times in their minds." (II. Book; ch. 8; Florio's transl. ed. Waller (Dent and Co.) III, 119.

l. 1246. (XII, 11) grapes.

In the German Ballad — See Des Knaben Wunderhorn I, 168, or Engel, no 293; *supra* p. 16 note 2. — Mefisto has to fetch „4 Ellen leinwand"!

l. 1269. (XII, 33) curtesie.

In the same connection we find *so great a courtesie*

in the E. F. B. (Thoms, III, 266) where Spiess (p. 88) has no equivalent. cf. note to B. 1711.

B. l. 1700. (after A. 1272.)

I, I, he does not stand much upon that *(viz.* ,his legge l. 1699).

There is of course a quibble upon the double meaning of *to stand upon* a thing. On the one hand it means: he does not care much about it, and on the other, of course, *stand* is used = to rest upon, referring to the fact that the leg was supposed to have been taken away.

B. l. 1711. (after A. 1272) remember your curtesie

It is hardly possible that *curtesie* should have the usual meaning here of ‚politeness' *a. s. quid.* It seems to be used in the more tangible, concrete meaning of that by which politeness, courtesie is shown, which, as the essence of courtesy may be said to be to give some one pleasure, we may perhaps take to be = pastime, merriment, joke. The line would then mean: If you don't remember what happened to your leg, then please remember at least the joke you played upon me.

In A. l. 1269: Rest beholding for this curtesie, where the word under consideration has no equivalent in the corresponding line in B. (1744) as little as in the corresponding passage of the E. F. B. (Thoms III p. 266) it may be used in either sense. I do not otherwise know of this word in the sense required. See the N. E. D. *in. v.* = a small quantity.

l. 1290. (XIII, 18).

For that I know your friendship is vnfained.

Mr. Pantin was not ‚the first to have fully set forth the points of agreement between Marlowe and the English History, as distinct from the German' (Ward, Introd. p. LXIX, note 3). On all his points he had been

anticipated; either by E. Schmidt or by Delius, with one exception, *viz.* the present line. But the case is not a very striking one: ‚for that you are all my friends' — see Thoms, III, p. 272 — is in the E. F. B. — whereas the G. F. B. has no equivalent. Mr. Pantin might have strengthened his case by quoting ‚that peareless dame of Greece' (l. 1293) = that stately pearl of Greece, — (Thoms *ib.)* for which the G. F. B. has again no equivalent; see Spiess-Braune p. 93.

l. 1293. (XIII, 21) that peerelesse Dame of Greece.

Such repetitions — the same phrase occurring twice — ‚distinctly shew difference of authorship', says Mr. Fleay *apud* Ward p. CXLII. See the note to l. 1308.

l. 1308. (XIII, 36). Ah Doctor Faustus.

„Wherever ‚Doctor' is used as a title to Faustus in addressing him, it indicates addition or alteration..... In the play as acted in 1588/9 I believe this title did not occur." Mr. Fleay *ib.*

Fleay is of course welcome to this belief, as to that quoted in the preceding note, and as argumentation in a case of ‚belief' is impossible, I can only ask in either case: ‚Is that so?'

l. 1322. (XIII, 50.) Hell calls.... with a roaring voyce.

Prof. Ward, like many of his countrymen, is rather given to seeing an allusion to a scriptural passage, where it is difficult for any one else to find it. I for one do not understand his reference to 1 St. Peter V, 8, where we read: ‚Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour'. When we think of the use made of Hellmouth in the English theatre even down to Marlowe's time, I see nothing extraordinary in Hell being spoken of as calling with a roaring

voice, and I fail to see that the writer must here have thought of a roaring lion. See a description of hellmouth in the Second Report of Dr. Faustus, Thoms III, p. 353.

l. 1324. (XIII, 52.) Mephastophilis giues (Faustus) a dagger.

Even supposing this incident to be ‚merely a clumsy imitation' of a former passage as Wagner (p. 131) would have it — he looks upon this as a ‚clumsy trick' — I can see no apriori ground why it could not for either, or both, of these reasons be Marlowe's. How do we know that Marlowe could not be guilty of repeating himself or of writing clumsily. This can certainly not be established by an excision of all the doubtful passages! But Ward has moreover called attention to a difference between the two passages in question. Cf. Ward p.p. 168 and 198 (notes to VI, 21 and the present line).

l. 1341. (XIII, 69). Ile in peecemeale teare thy flesh.

Ward gives references for *piecemeal* but does not explain the *in* of all the Quartos. Must *in peecemeale* be looked upon as a case of contamination or does it show that the force of the suffix *meal* was not understood any more? It is perhaps only a coincidence but may be worth remarking that in the corresponding passage of the E. F. B. we find ‚teare thee in pieces', (Thoms III, 280). See A. 1441 = B. 1936: *in peeces*. Spiess p. 100 has: zü stücken.

l. 1363. (XIII, 91).

Was this the face that lancht a thousand shippes?

It does not seem to have been remarked that this passage, on whose beauty the Edd. comment — and rightly so — suggested at least three lines in the B-texts. See B. ll. 1407, 1410 and 1773 seq. This last passage

‚Was this faire Hellen, whose admired worth Made *Greece* with ten yeares warres afflict poore Troy?' might indeed be supposed to have formed part of the original text (in which case Marlowe would merely have repeated himself) but it is not likely, since very much the same idea is expressed in A. l.l. 1300 seq. With regard to l.l. 1407 and 1410 (‚Was this that sterne aspect, that awfull frowne', etc. and ‚Was this that damned head, whose heart conspir'd *Benvolio's* shame' etc.), they almost read like a sort of travesty. The same expression occurs in Troilus and Cressida, II, 2, 82.

l. 1382. XIII, 110). *Old man.* Accursed Faustus *etc.*

„It does not seem to me absolutely necessary here to begin a new scene, as Dyce and Mr. Bullen suggest, though in the corresponding passage of the Faustbuch the old Man's repulse of the Devils occurs two days after Faustus's second contract with Mephistophiles." Thus runs Prof. Ward's note which is inaccurate in so far as it suggests much more than it should do. Without laying undue stress upon it (the matter is indeed of secondary importance) it must be mentioned that in the prose-text there is only question of the repulse of Mephistophiles, and that although this *does* take place ‚two days after Faustus's second contract with M.' there is very much less parallelism than Ward's note suggests in so much as the whole situation is different in the prose-texts from what it is in the Drama. Here it is our old friend who visits Dr. Faustus in the latter's house, — is asked to retire, comes back and is then attacked by the ‚Divelles'. There, the old man invites Dr. Faustus to his, the former's place, and after he has retired of his own will (not having been politely asked to do so by Faustus as in the Drama) he is visited by Mephistophiles who tries to ‚lay hold upon him'

but he is ‚mocked and jested' away „about two days after that he had exhorted Faustus" (Thoms III, p. 281) and it does not say two days after the contract. But all this would certainly not be incompatible with the assumption af a break here, if that were required for other reasons. What is of more importance in this connection, is that in A. l. 1332 Faustus asks the man to leave him ‚*a while* to ponder on my sinnes'. This points more to a return of the old man in the same scene, than in another. Remember that this *a while* (as a matter of fact, tho whole return of ‚that base and crooked age') is not in either of the two prose-texts.

l. 1392 seq. (sc. XIV).

This scene is ‚extremely doubtful', says Wagner p. XXX note 1. He is of course welcome to this opinion, but I cannot let it go without protesting against a method of arguing which Wagner employs and which I think it better to abstain from qualifying. In this scene he has ‚admitted two long passages only found' in the B-texts, *viz.* B. l.l. 1861-1888 (in his, Wagner's ed. V. 2, 1-29) and B. l.l. 1955-2002 (Wagner V, 2, 95-142). Why he has admitted those at all, — and of all places into a ‚doubtful' scene! — I do not see, but surely it is going too far if then (cf. p. 134), referring to one of the thus interpolated lines, he goes on as follows: „l. 105 seq. We will not fail once more to draw the student's attention to these jingling rhymes which are not at all in Marlowe's style: on the contrary" etc. This shuffling in of an admittedly non-Marlowian-text into a doubtful scene and then attacking the whole scene by the aid of arguments drawn from the inserted lines, such a proceeding must stand without any commentary!

l. 1395. (XIV, 4). now I die eternally.

Compare ‚to wound thy ever dying hart', The story of The shepherdess Felismena. Morley's ed. of 2 Gent. of Verona; Nat. Libr. p. 161; and ‚die in thought before they come to blows,' Greene's Selimus l. 1167. Marlowe found in his original, — and in connection with Faustus' ‚Mourning and Sorrowing with himself' too (ch. LVIII) — ‚fears every hour to die' (Thoms, III, p. 290; Spiess, p. 190, has no equivalent).

l. 1460 seqq. (XIV, 64 seqq.) Ah Faustus, *etc.*

Münch [1]) p. 13 note, draws attention to a parallel scene in Edward II and Sarrazin (William Shakespeare's Lehrjahre, Weimar 1897 p. 77) is reminded of the Death-scene in the pre-Shakespearean Drama of King John, as well as of a scene in Henry VI.

See Thoms ch. LX for Marlowe's possible source and another very striking passage in the prose-text (Thoms III, p. 196, ch. XV) which Marlowe may have had in his mind when writing this beautiful scene. See also the chapter mentioned in the discussion of l.l. 1479, seqq. in § 3 of chapter II.

Commentators have been greatly puzzled (see *e. g.* Ward p. 203) by the apparent unintelligibility of a passage in the E. F. B. which corresponds to l.l. 1463, seq. of our text:

> Stand still you ever moouing spheres of heaven,
> That time may cease, and midnight never come,

and cf. l.l. 1496 seqq.

> Impose some end to my incessant paine,
> Let Faustus liue in hel a thousand yeeres,
> A hundred thousand, and at last be sau'd!

[1]) *Die innere Stellung Marlowe's zum Volksbuch von Faust.* Bonn 1879. Unfortunately for the results of this otherwise excellent paper, it is based on a comparison of the German instead of the English text.

i. e. a passage where Faust laments the fact that his punishment is to be eternal.

The corresponding passage in the E. F. B. runs as follows: Ah! that I could carry the heavens upon my shoulders so that there were time at last to quit me of this everlasting damnation. Delius' words (p. 20) imply that there is no equivalent for these words in the German-text, — Delius has spoken, — Delius is great and Ward is his prophet, and hence we find Ward acquiescing in this verdict. But why did not Prof. Ward — who is continually throwing the German text at our inoffensive heads when it is no use! — why did not Ward look it up and quote it here? Too much confidence — even in such an authority as Doctor Delius — is dangerous. The German text, the immediate source of the E. F. B. will give us light. It says there (Spiess p. 114): Ach ich wolte gerne desz Himmels entbehren [1]), wann ich nur der ewigen straffe köndt entfliehen," *i. e.* Ah! I would gladly forego Heaven if I might only escape eternal punishment. But our friend P. F. who, although a ‚Gent.' (title page), was not a very great German Scholar (as we have already suspected a propos of l. 900) doing as many a schoolboy — and others alas! — would do nowadays, reasoned very much as follows: *entbehren* reminding him of (to) *bear*, he jumped to the conclusion that it must be the same. And regardless of context *i. e.* of sense, he made a bold shot at it and wildly translated: Ah that I could carry the heavens upon my shoulders. [2]) Marlowe — if he had his source before him here — made something of it which fitted his context. [3])

[1]) Wolfenbüttel M.S. Empörn!

[2]) Delius explains this passage — which is nonsense — by assuming it to be a reminiscence of the play!

[3]) So did possibly the ballad writer, — *infra* ch. § 3.

l. 1470. (XIV, 74) the clocke will strike.

The Editor of the Times Whistle for the E. E. T. S. (N°. 48), Mr. Cowper, suggests (on p. XXI of his Introduction) that when R. C., the author wrote the following lines

> Another Faustus, haplesse, hopelesse man,
> What wilt thou doe, when as that litle sand
> Of thy soone emptied houreglasse, is spent?

(l. 1625 seqq.) he must have had Marlowe's play in his mind, ‚although it may be said the story was common enough for' R. C. ‚to have got it elsewhere.' It would have cost Mr. Cowper little trouble to find out that R. C. did get it ‚elsewhere' *viz.* in the E. F. B. For both the prose-text and the Times whistle have the ‚hourglass'. (See Thoms III p. 295 = Spiess p. 116: ‚das Stundtglass'. Marlowe substituted a Clock. [1])

l.l. 1500 seqq.

> Why wert thou not a creature wanting soule?.....
> Ah Pythagoras *Metempsychosis*, were that true,
> This soule should flie from me, and I be changde
> Unto some brutish beast, *etc.*

Thoms III, p. 291 (ch. LX): how happy wert thou, if, as an unreasonable beast, thou mightest die with' (Read: without) ‚a soul', etc.; Spiess (p. 113): warumb bin ich nit ein Vieh, so one Seel stirbet."

The reader will probably remember Malvolio's exposition of this doctrine in Twelfth Night IV, 2, 54.

[1]) Wagner too (p. XXXIX) and Francke (p. XXIV) — as I find subsèquently — quote this as a proof of the popularity of Marlowe's play. The allusions are often so vague, that it is impossible to make out whether they are to the play or to the prose-text. Messrs. Ward, Wagner and Francke who have collected a great many of them — especially Francke — have not always kept this in view. I subjoin three references to the Faustus-matter (to use a safe term) which, I think, have not been noticed before.

1610. Jonson's Alchemist, IV, 4: Or he is the Faustus that casteth figures and can conjure, cures Plagues, piles and pox, by the ephemerides, And holds intelligence with all the bawds And midwives of three shires".....(ed. Cunningham, II, 59) There is nothing exactly like this in the play, nor in the prose history.

1620. The Glasse of Time in the first age, by Th. Peyton of Lincolnes Inne, Gent. Writing about atheists such as ‚The monster vile within the Gospel curst', Peyton says he cannot mention all, „But one neere us instead of all i'll cite, Whose scandall foul about the world is blown His story rife amongst us all well known. *Faustus* by name, by birth a German bred," *etc. etc.* through another two dozen lines. There is little to point to either play or prose-text, but we may take ‚How with a knife made he in (read *his) veins* to bleed' as pointing to the prose *(vein,* Thoms p. 176) rather than to the play (cf. l. 489 and my note to this line); moreover his ‚bowels mangled' are found ‚cast out upon a dunghill ground', — this is not in the play (not even in B) and it is in the prose-text. (See Thoms p. 299). I quote the reprint, published at New York (Alden) in 1886 (p. 132).

1658. Cowley's Cutter of Colman. A lady, Aurelia, is called ‚that little Mephistophilus' (III, 2 ed. 1721 p. 787 the same who is afterwards called my little Matchiavil (V, 13, p. 827); quoted by Edward Meyer, *Machiaveli and the Elizabethan Drama,* 1897. p. 175. It is impossible to decide whether this is a reference to the prose-text or to the drama.

The solitary Dutch reference, which I happen to have noticed, may also find a place here:

Jan Vos, Klucht van Oene (Gedichten ed. 1726, II p. 238):
Oene: Schoon men van Dokter Faustus wel een groot wonder zag
Zoo is hy by jou niet mier als ien veest by ien donderslag.
For the known references to the Faustus matter, see Wagner p. XXXVI seqq.; Francke p.p. XIV seqq.; Ward p.p. CX and 113 and see Prof. Herford's Literary Relations, p.p. 189 seqq.

Professor Flügel has recently unearthed a reference to Dr. Faustus as a gamester, see Anglia 18, 333: „Now, if the irreverent doctor Fawstus, or some such grave patron of great play showld protest *etc.* (From sir John Harington ± 1597) and he does not know of any parallels as Faustus is nowhere mentioned as a gamester. He is however mentioned as such in Widmann-Pfitzer: first part ch. XIV, where he is re-

presented as saying to his ‚familiar': Schaffe mir, o Mephistophiles, Geld, woher du es gleich nemen soltest, denn ich bin gar geneigt zum Spielen, welches ich auch für mein liebstes exercitium halte" etc. (ed. A. v. Keller, p. 154), and see the Anmerckung III, *ib.* p. 160. —

[See now also: A. Tille, *Die Faustsplitter in der Literatur des sechzehnten bis achtzehnten Jahrhunderts,* etc. Weimar, Felber. 1898.

The first part of this interesting publication (containing the allusions down to the year 1654) reaches me only just in time to mention it here in this note. If it had been published a little earlier, I might have had frequent occasion to refer to it, but I am not sure that it contains anything, which must necessarily have found a place in my Notes. I hope to take an early opportunity of referring to it at some greater length. July 1898.]

CHAPTER II.

The questions of authorship and the sources of the play, touched on in the preceding pages, neces sarily call for some recapitulation.

We shall have to consider first which is the relation of Marlowe to the text of 1604, — and then treat of the question as to whether or no, he had a hand in the scenes which are found in the B-texts and not in the A-texts. Having thus circumscribed — as far as possible — what must be understood by the term Marlowe's work, we shall try to establish the question of his sources on a somewhat firmer basis than was done heretofore.

§ 1. Marlowe and the A-text.

First then, — the ‚Addycyons' in the quarto of 1604, the *editio princeps* [1]) of our play. When attention was first called to the passage about Doctor Lopez (l. 1183. XI, 46) by Dyce and when he had pointed out that this passage must have been written after 1594 (the year of Dr. Lopez' death) as it could not have been written by Marlowe, who was dead (1593) before Lo-

[1]) It is quite true that an earlier ed. máy have existed — cf. Breymann Introd. p. XXXI — but we do not know, — we can at any rate not count with it, since it does not exist. And it becomes unlikely, if we remember that the edition of 1604 was entered in the Stationers' registers on January 7th 1601. (Ward[3] p. CVI.)

pez 'came into notoriety' (see my note to l. 1183); when besides, two passages in Henslowe's diary had been brought to light, or rather had been brought to bear on the subject in hand, in which passages we read that in 1597 and in 1602 ‚addycyons' had been made to Faustus, then it did indeed seem that we had here a 'tangible trace of interpolation'. (Wagner p. XXIX)

The first entry runs:

Pd. unto Thomas Dickers the 20 of Desembr 1597, for adycyons to Fostus twentie shellinges, and fyve shellinges for a prolog to Marloes Tamberlen, so in all I payde twenty five shellinges'.

and the second:

Lent unto the companye, the 22 of novembr 1602, to paye unto Wm. Birde and Samwell Rowley for their adicyones in Docter Fostes, the some of . . . . . iiij lᵇ.—

Now, let it remembered that, although we hear of these additions, nothing could put us on the trace of *which* scenes or passages were meant, and it can then not be a source of astonishment to any one, to hear that quite a host of writers, in fact all such as occupied themselves with the subject at all, came down upon poor Marlowe, and that for various reasons. If there is then an excuse for the fact that they did look out for internal traces of these additions there is none for the extent to which Commentators (some of them at least) went, and there is even less for their going on when, as will be seen, all external reasons had disappeared. It is not too much to say that three quarters, if not more of these cases, thus created, would never have been looked upon as interpolations, if the passages in Henslowe's diary quoted, had not lent colour to that view, nay, had not invited commentators, so to speak, to look for them, and to tax their ingenuity to the utmost in this direction.

Those that have gone farthest in this way are Messrs. Fleay and Delius.

We have already had occasion to admire, more than once, the delicious cocksureness with which the former tells us what is Marlowe's and what, not being his, must be Decker's. Breymann has truly said of his results that Marlowe's part in Dr. Faust would be reduced to a minimum if Fleay's hypotheses were accepted. Mr. Fleay is almost surpassed by Delius who has the most fantastic views on the original Marlowian elements in the A-text. It will be necessary and sufficient to refer to what I have said before [1]) on the work of this uncritical critic. Even the final scene does not find grace in Dr. Delius' eyes!

Well, — the array of external reasons seemingly pointing to interpolations, which ‚must' be there, waiting as it were for discovery, is indeed formidable. An interpolation to be dated prior to 1594; additions of 1597, and others in 1602 for which was given four times the sum, paid in the first instance! It will at once be seen however that these three items do not have the same value. The scene in which the Doctor Lopez-episode occurs, may stand as genuine, even for him who rejects the line in question. For all that, the ‚interpolation' here has been proven clearly enough, even for so prudent a critic as Professor Breymann, to make him look upon it as established. [2])

With regard to the additions by Messrs. Birde and Rowley, — it is with great probability that we may

[1]) See the note to l. 195.

[2]) See Breymann's ed. p. XXXI. ‚Several circumstances' we read there ‚speak in favour of' this hypothesis. Prof. Breymann then refers in a note to Ward[2] p.p. LVIII and XCVIII *i. e.* ib.[3] p.p. LXIII and CV, where we find the Lopez-passage quoted and l. 1436 of the B-texts. (See my notes to these lines.) So the ‚several circumstances' means *two*.

assume them — as *e. g.* Messrs. Ulrici, Fleay and Breymann do [1]) — not to have been incorporated in any edition prior to the 1616-one. It is indeed very unlikely that we should have to look upon any scene in the previous editions as belonging to the year 1602. For ‚a booke called *the plaie of Doctor FAUSTUS*' was entered by Thomas Bushell into the Registers of the Stationers' Company. [2]) And considering that Bushell was the publisher of the 1604-ed., and that the copyright was not made over to J. Wright, the publisher of the B-text, until 1610, it is all but certain that the 1604-text contains none of the additions for which Messrs. Birde and Rowley received their four pounds.

So the 1597 additions only remain of all the external proofs on which to rely for the assumption that the play had undergone considerable alterations before the year when it was first published. 1597! A likely year forsooth, — the very year when the performances appear to have been stopped in consequence of the receipts, which had 'attained iiij L^{i} xij^{s}, sinking down to v^{s}, — and in October 1597 apparently to nothing at all [3]). And although these additions were supposed to have been written in December of this year, we need not imagine that a couple of new scenes would bring a vanishing audience back to the Rose-theatre.

No wonder indeed, that (in 1881) this entry has been shown to be a modern forgery! But what we do expect is, that, when this became known, commentators would content themselves with using only the internal arguments and have done with aprioristical reasonings. It is only too evident that the general im-

---

[1]) See Breymann p. XXXII; Ward p. CVI, etc.
[2]) See Ward, p. LXII.
[3]) See Ward, p. LXII.

pression created by this *apriori* evidence has taken such deep root that, although the cause has been taken away, the effect does not cease. Relying on that staff, we thought we *knew* that additions were made before the text was ever printed, — and all we had to do was to find them out. Now that this staff has proved a reed and its much-needed support is gone, we can only say that, *if* we find internal proofs, we must be prepared to accept those results, but no reason for expecting any such results remains.

In other words: whereas hitherto those, holding that everything in the A-texts was by Marlowe, had the *onus probandi* on their side, in as much as, if they would have their point established, they had to prove that somehow everything was actually written by Marlowe, — now, owing to Mr. Warner's discovery the scales are turned and the burden of proof rests once more on the shoulders of those, who look upon the first Quarto as containing non-Marlowian elements, for it is they, who have to point out these ‚interpolations' and in so doing they will furnish their opponents with what I should like to call attackable material, — objections that do not float about in the air, but have some sort of substantial real existence. Some such arguments have indeed been brought forward, — I must refer my readers to the discussion of them in my first chapter where they will be found met. See my notes to l.l. 106; 195; 266; 356; 722; 870; 939-1030; 1183 seq.q.; 1293; 1308 and 1392.

What I pretend to have proved is — it may be as well to lay special stress on this — nót:

that Marlowe must be considered to be the author of the whole of the A-text, but only:

that we have as yet not one positive proof that he was not.

The distinction may seem a subtle one, but it is not so in reality, as my reader will see on referring to the notes quoted. It is quite possible that one day it will be established beyond reasonable doubt that there are interpolations of scenes in the A-text; all I think to have made clear is that this is not established *yet*. It is on the other hand also possible that some day we may be able to go further and conclude: As there is no proof of any ‚addition' in A., Marlowe is the author of all, contained in the edition of 1604, but that time has certainly not come yet.

We hear a great deal in these discussions of Marlowe's humour.

I am very much afraid that the reasoning of a good many commentators must be qualified as a *circulus vitiosus*, for they base this contention about the absence of humour in Marlowe on the impression got by the reading of expurgated texts such as Marlowe's Tamburlaine; — does not the printer R. I. tell us that he has ‚(purposely) omitted and left out' the ‚fond and friuolous Iestures' in it and will any one dare to maintain that it is *proven* that these were nót by Marlowe? [1]) And who will say what has happened to other Marlowian texts? And, in the case of Dr. Faustus, — is not this same impression brought about by the reading of such texts as Dyce's, Bullen's, Ward's and Wagner's, where there is at every page a note of warning: Mind, this is not Marlowe's, or a sign-post: ‚This way — to Decker! — for the buffoonery, please'? Would it not be far more scientific to accept the text *as it is* as Marlowe's with all its buffoonery until *positive* proof has been brought forward that such and such a scene *is* not by him?

[1]) This is again assumed by the commentators without proof!

And, after all, why should the comic scenes nót be by him? Because Marlowe was ‚totally destitute of humour', as *e. g.* Mr. Saintsbury [1]) tells us, and this humour, he goes on, is a ‚characteristic which, united with his tragic and imaginative powers, make Shakespere as, in a less degree, it makes Homer, and even, though the humour is grim and intermittent, Dante.' And hence Prof. Saintsbury concludes, it is ‚not wise, ... to say that, had (Marlowe) lived, and had his lot been happily cast, we should have had two Shakesperes.' I think we are here at the root of the mistake concerning Marlowe's humour. Well, yes, if we compare the comic scenes in Marlowe's Faustus to the World's poetic Trio, I have no doubt that we must judge Marlowe not to come up to that standard. But the mistake of Marlowists consists in confusing two entirely different things. May not a man try his hand at humour, fail, and end in buffoonery? Is this latter word too strong for the comic scenes in Faust? ‚As the populace in Horace's time clamoured ‚media inter carmina', for a bear or a boxer' says Mr. Bullen', (Introduction p. XXVIII) ‚so an Elizabethan audience, when it felt bored or scared, insisted on being enlivened by a fool or a clown.' Well, they must have been scared with a vengeance! And why should Marlowe form an exception to ‚the' poets in his time, about whom Mr. Bullen tells us that ‚after a little fuming and fretting' they ‚accepted the conditions; they soon found that the demand of the audience was no outrage upon nature ....' etc. Why? because 'Marlowe could not don alternately the buskin and the sock.' Here, I am afraid, is our circle and a very ‚vicious' one it is!

We may have our doubts about Marlowe's humour and the quality of the ‚comicality' in Dr. Faustus —

[1]) Elizabethan Literature, p. 78.

although I must in this connection refer to my note on l. 1155 — but to say that, because Marlowe had no humour, he could not have written the comic scenes in the 1604 edition, seems to me a proposition which errs not only most probably in its major but also and more especially in the conclusion, — I for one do not look upon these scenes as first-rate.

If then I must conclude that, so far as I can see now, Marlowe is substantially the author of the A-text, we must complete our investigation of Marlowe's work by asking if the original ‚Faustus' may not have contained more than is found in A. This brings us to the relation between Marlowe and the B-text.

§ 2. Marlowe and the B-text.

If we think, not of entire scenes, but of some lines only, there can hardly be any doubt that an affirmative answer must be given to the question: ‚Is anything of what is now only found in the B-texts to be attributed to Marlowe? A reference to the preceding notes on l.l. 812, 834 and 850, will be sufficient here. I am not sure that Bullen is not thinking of a line here and there only, when formulating his hypothesis as to the revision by Marlowe of his work (Introduction, p.p. XXX—XXXIII), but it is of course difficult to distinguish between an insertion of ‚lines' and of ‚a passage.' At any rate, the question assumes quite a different aspect when we think of the possibility of whole scenes in B. being possibly by Marlowe. I do not wish to go beyond the ‚possibly.' Let me be allowed to state emphatically that, what I have advanced concerning this question [in my notes to l.l. A. 356 (*i. e.* B. 1436), 812, 834, 850, 939 seq.q., 956, 1234] as ‚pointing in the direction of this assumption', would certainly not suffice in my mind to conclude

that Marlowe *did* write part of B. or some such thing. I wrote down those conclusions because they were forced in upon my mind, and because they may be useful to subsequent investigators — be it only to prove that they are untenable — nót to foist the deduction upon the unwary reader that there is here any certainty. [1])

A large part of the 1616 quarto is post-Marlowian or Messrs. Bird and Rowley would not have got four pounds for their additions and I do not think that the Bruno-scenes (see *supra* p. 94) alone — which no one has claimed for Marlowe [2]) — would have sufficed.

That the A-text does at any rate not represent all of Marlowe's work is rendered probable by the considerations on the Sandelo episode, for which I may refer to the note on l. 915 [3])

§ 3. The source of Marlowe's play.

We now approach the important question whence Marlowe drew the material out of which he developed his fine play. The question has often been treated of before and my conclusion — that Marlowe used only the English History and nót the German text — will be found to contain little new, — still

[1]) We must be careful about detecting Marlowe's ‚mighty line' in the B-text, — for who shall say that such lines as *e. g.* B. 1159, 1169, 1179—1181 can be only by Marlowe and not by an imitator? Or may we conclude that, when lines have the „true Marlowian ring — easily enough established to one's own satisfaction but rarely to that of others! — they múst be by him and cánnot be by an imitator, seeing that ‚Mr. Benjamin Johnson judged Mr. Marlow's mighty lines .... Examples fitter for admiration than for parallel.'? I hardly think so (See Times Whistle, Introd. p. XIX, note).

[2]) It must be by mistake that Max Koch speaks of them as Marlowian (Shakespeare-Jahrbuch 21, 218).

[3]) See also Ward[3] p. 185 (scene lost, according to Dyce) which I quote for what it may be worth.

I think, I am justified in devoting some space to this question. For notwithstanding all that has been written about it — especially by Schmidt (in *Lemcke's Jahrbuch*, vol 14) which, I should have thought, must already have convinced the most incredulous — the ‚enough' has not yet been reached, witness the fact that Professor Ward, the author of the most elaborate edition of our play, who began by believing that Marlowe used the German Volksbuch, has now (in his third edition, see p.p. LXVII seqq.) only come so far as to hesitate between the two versions and, although he evidently leans towards the E. F. B. — „The Faustbuch, then, either mainly or wholly through its English version, must be regarded as the source of the tragedy of Doctor Faustus", p. LXXIII — he actually still prints a translation [1]) of the German Volksbuch!

I hope that, in view of the additional matter adduced in the preceding pages, the question will be judged to have been set at rest. [2])

It will perhaps be well to consider first the arguments that have been brought forward in favour of the opposite view. I know of only two. The first looks very suspicious indeed. In l. 819 (VII, 2) we read of ‚the stately towne of *Trier*'. As the German F. B. (both the Spiess and the Wolfenbüttel texts, on p. 51) here has Trier, and as we read in Thoms that Faustus *came to Trent* (p. 222) the conclusion seems unavoidable that Marlowe here at least had the German text

[1]) And in order to ‚avoid an unnecessary Germanism', he confesses to having borrowed here and there a phrase *from the English History!* (p. LXXV). Surely, Professor Ward should have reflected twice before doing so, — this is rendering it impossible to work upon his material independently!

[2]) Francke (l.l. p. XV), thinks it ‚desirable, nay necessary' that the certain proof should be brought that Marlowe has used the German text. Can Jingoism go farther?

before him and not the English one. For, why should Marlowe have ‚substituted' Trier instead of Treves [1]) for Trent?

Well, — why not? May he not have preferred the German name (with which he was so well acquainted that he knew its etymology, — cf. Works ed. Dyce, p. 377a) to what was after all another foreign form, *viz.* Trèves?

But speculations as to what he might have done are futile, — let us come to the point at once and say that Trent is the reading of the later editions only. The ed. of 1592 in the British Museum has „*and came to Treir*" (sic! p. 34). So Marlowe did not ‚substitute' anything; he speaks of Trier because he found it in his English Source. [2])

Professor Ward brings forward a second argument, — very hesitatingly it is true, but for all that it can do no harm to refute here any force it might still seem to possess. „I cannot say" we read on p. LXX — „that I have convinced myself that any other passages occur in the play which are in agreement with the Faustbuch, but not with the History. An exception might perhaps be made in favour of the magnificent lines expanding a passage in the Faustbuch, which has no parallel in the History, but here a well-known, though of course not really parallel, passage in Scripture might have been in the mind of the dramatist."

Ward does not say which magnificent lines he means but from a comparison of the ‚passage in Scripture' and one in Ch. LXIV (not LXV as he prints) of the

[1]) Perhaps I should add here for non-English readers that Treves is the name by which Englishmen call the ‚city of the holy coat'.

[2]) I do not understand why Ward calls this an *emendation* of the English History upon its original! (p. LXX). Read *pejoratio*? — quod emendatio saepe fit!

G. F. B. it appears that he is thinking of ll. 1479 seq.q.

> Mountaines and hilles, come, come, and fall on me,
> And hide me from the heauy wrath of God,
> No, No!
> Then wil I headlong runne into the earth:
> Earth gape! O no, it wil not harbour me.

Now, any one comparing the Scriptural passages quoted by Ward, (Hosea 10, 8 and ‚perhaps also' Ps. 139, 7—12 [1]) will see that they could at most be considered as a parallel to l. 1479 but at any rate not to what follows. Personally I do not think there is any parallel at all, — as I have already observed in the note to l.l. 1460 seqq., Marlowe may have taken the general drift of this passage from what is found in Thoms p.p. 196 and 291 seq.; but some of my readers may agree with Ward in finding a decided resemblance between l.l. 1480 seqq. and the passage quoted by him from the German text and which Prof. Ward translates thus (p. LXXI note 1): ‚Where shall I hide myself? Into what refuge shall I creep or flee?' The German text has (Spiess-Braune, p. 111); wo sol ich mich verbergen? wohin sol ich mich verkriechen oder fliehen?" And as there is no equivalent for this passage to be found in Thoms, it would really seem established at last that Marlowe was indebted to the German text.

But appearances are deceitful, — it so happens that the 1592 ed. contains a chapter, which is not found in Thoms, and this chapter, no. 60 of the first extant edition, is the faithful translation of ch. 64 of the German text, — we therefore find in it the exact equivalent of the German passage in question „Would God that I knew where to hide me, or into what place to creepe

---

[1]) See also his note to XIV, 83 on p. 204.

or flie." [1]) So here again, influence of the German text on Marlowe is not proven.

Here, the arguments of our *clarissimus opponens* being exhausted, we should turn from the negative to the positive side of the question, were it not that I have myself come across one or two passages, which seem to point in the same direction.

In l. 494 seqq. (V 96.) we read: First, Secondly, Thirdly, Fourthly and Lastly, — the same adverbs are found in Spiess (p. 18) and not in Thoms! It might perhaps suffice to remark that we can safely trust Marlowe with a sufficient amount of knowledge of the third of the three R's, to have supplied them himself, but there is fortunately more to convince those who would not go quite that length! If my incredulous reader will kindly turn to my note on l. 540, he will see that Marlowe must have had this very chapter of the English History before him when writing out (I use the word advisedly!) this passage. Surely he would have felt no necessity to turn to any other text! There are moreover five points enumerated in Marlowe's text and five in Thoms, against six in Spiess, and the probability is very great indeed that in the text which Marlowe had before him [2]) the adverbs in question were found.

In l. 848 (VII, 31) we read of Rome standing „upon seven hilles," — in Spiess we have (p. 58): „und jenseyt der rechten Seyten, begreifft die Statt *Sieben* Berg," and there is no equivalent in the English text.

[1]) See also Thoms p. 196: „So impossible it is for thee to hide thyself from God, as it is impossible for thee to remove the mountains," . . . . . .

[2]) I discovered this and the next discrepancies after having consulted the 1592 ed. in the British Museum; hence I cannot now say whether Thoms deviates here perhaps from this text as so often.

I think there is as little in this case as in the preceding one, and in order to make this clear it will be sufficient to succinctly repeat my argument concerning ll. 494 seqq. Marlowe might be credited with this knowledge about the seven hills of Rome; there can be no imaginable reason why he should have turned to an other text than the one he had before him when writing this passage, for this one fact about the seven hills — see notes to l.l. 821, 824, 828, 830, 834, 850 etc. etc., — and there is moreover the possibility that these words were found in the text that Marlowe worked upon.

Last not least — in l. 1052 (X, 19) we read about the „sundry thoughts" which „arose About the honour" of the Emperor's ancestor. The corresponding passage in Spiess runs (p. 74): „dass ich auff ein Zeit, — in Gedancken gestanden" whereas in Thoms we find (p. 249): „I called to mind." If my reader will not accept as an argument to be reminded of the fact that there exists such a thing as *chance*, — and I shall be the first to grant that this is a very weak staff to lean upon — I may refer him to my note on l.l. 1050 seqq. whence it will become clear that Marlowe had again the English text before him. I must therefore once more conclude: as there is no reason to presume Marlowe to have referred to an other text for this one word, he who does not choose to believe in chance, must necessarily assume him to have had a text before him slightly different from that, printed by Thoms.

The fact is that these considerations are of no value whatsoever in opposition to that large amount of matter collected in the preceding notes, which points to Marlowe's having used and even largely drawn upon, nay having here and there copied out the English History. I think however the recapitulation of the dis-

cussion bearing upon this point should be accompanied by a note of warning. Not all the notes where the question was touched upon have the same evidential force. Such conclusions, expressed or understood as those made use of in l.l. 12, 800, 812, 884, 890, 1069, 1191, 1341 and 1500 would never have been formulated, if I had not had quite a host of others to back up the position assumed. Again, the notes to l.l. 259 and 1064 will be of any value in this discussion only for him who accepts — independently of the question here at issue — the slight emendations involved; but it is chiefly to the discussion to be found in the notes to l.l. 257, 540 (containing many cases in point), 688, 722, 821, 824, 828, 830, 834. 850, 852, 854, 859, 891, 897, 902, 1031 seq.q. and 1050 seqq. (these last two containing again many cases in point), 1085, 1149, 1234 (containing three cases in point) 1269, 1290 and 1395, — that I trusted when I expressed the hope that the question will henceforth be considered as no longer *sub judice*.

An attempt has been made, it is true, to explain the points of resemblance, by assuming the translator to have made use of the drama. Wagner was driven into this position (see Anglia 2, 311) because the resemblances were too palpable too be denied and because the 1592 ed. — which was known to be in existence, although all the commentators worked on Thoms! — was assumed to be the *editio princeps*. It is with great pleasure that I can here refer to Dr. Delius' work p. 7 seqq. — who has shown quite conclusively that Wagner's view is untenable, — it is impossible to assume that the translator could have had any reason to follow alternately the G. F. B., ánd the drama.

And the date is no difficulty, for there cannot be the slightest doubt that the E. F. B. was already in

existence before Marlowe wrote his Faust. The English Ballad [1]) which was entered on the Stationers' registers on the last day of February 1588 [2]) (O.S. *i. e.* February the 28th 1589 N.S.) cannot be founded on the play, as Mr. Bullen suggests (p.XXVI, see below) nor is it possible to agree with Wagner who, after having told us on p. XXIII that Spiess' work had ‚furnished the subject' of it, concludes on p. XXVI ‚that the ballad was founded upon mere oral relation of the legend'. After what has been written on the subject (see *e. g.* Breymann Introd. p. XXIX) it should not be necessary any more to prove that the ballad is founded on the English prose-text. But considering that Prof. Ward ‚cannot . . . ., to speak frankly, regard the evidence as absolutely conclusive' it will not be considered a waste of time, nor of space if I approach the subject once more.

The ballad is but small in comparison to the play and the prose-history, so we cannot expect to find many reminiscences, but what indications we need, will, I think, be found in the following table:

[1]) It is printed *e. g.* by Ward, p, CIII. There can be no harm in printing a collation here, which I made of Ward's text with a slightly different one, from a copy in the Bodleian library, – Press Mark „Wood, 401" (p. 53). I do not give such *variae lectiones* as concern orthography only.

(In Ward) title: upon one John] Wood: upon John; Tune of] The tune is; l. 5: Wittenburge] Witten ber berg, *with the first* ber *crossed out*; l. 6: Germany] Jermany; l. 7: afterwards] afterward; l. 10 in] of; l. 11, left] gave; l. 17: weeds] weed; l. 18: streight] soon; l. 22 devils deed] Divel a deed; l. 24: peace] pride; l. 26: length] end; l. 29: first] then; l. 36 cause of all] causer of; *After this stanza we find in Wood:* The second Part, To the same tune *and a woodcut*; l. 41 he] *omitted;* l. 45 pleasure] pleasures; l. 50: was] were; l. 54: dread] grief; l. 55: and] all; l. 64: none could comfort me] comfort none could be; l. 68: dreadful] doleful; l. 69: present, lo] presently; l. 70: was] were; l. 72: an] the; l. 78: fear such mortal] feel such grievous. – Printed *etc.*] Printed for T. Coles, T. Vere, W. Gilbertson.

[2]) Wagner p. XXIII has: Ultimo die ffebruarij 1589, – which must be a misprint.

	Ballad.	E. F. B. Thoms.	Dr. Faustus.
1.	l. 9. my uncle brought me up	an uncle p. 165	l. 14 kinsmen
2.	11. left me all his wealth	made him his heir p. 166.	*no equivalent*
3.	21 seqq. Twice	cf. Thoms p.p. 176 and 280; see *ib.* p. 295: twice confirmed writings with my proper blood,	*only one compact scene* (l.l. 535 seqq.)
4.	29 seq. Would I had first been made a beast by kind! | Then had I not so vainly set my mind; | Or would when reason first began to bloom, | Some darksome den had been my deadly tomb!	how happy wert thou, if, as an unreasonable beast . . . . set thee in an unspeakable place of darkness . . . Thoms p. 291.	some brutish beast l. 1504
5.	41 seqq. The devil he carried me up into the sky. — Where I did see how all the world did lie; | I went about the world in eight daies space, | And then return'd into my native place.	,the dragons' (come by command of Mephistophiles, Faustus' spirit and servant) ,carried me up right into the air . . . . on Tuesday seven nights following I cam home again that's eight days . . . . Thoms p. 216.	*not in the A-text.*
6.	l. 62 I turn'd my hourglass, for my last hour to run;	hourglass p. 290.	clock (strikes) l.l. 1459, 1470.

	Ballad.	E. F. B. Thoms.	Dr. Faustus.
7.	l. 65 my glass was almost out	my hourglass is at an end p. 295.	watch strikes l. 1490.
8.	l. 69 They came into the hall.	the students went into the hall, p. 298.	*no equivalent.*

The evidence here collected is of unequal value. It will be seen upon investigation that, if all the seven cases point to the ballad-writer knowing the prose-text, — they do not each and all prove it. For, with regard to nos 2 and 8, it may be objected that to establish a thing by negatives is a dangerous proceeding. No. 5 — where there is no equivalent in A, but for which one may be seen in B (l.l. 800 seqq.) — would be of value in our demonstration only, if we had absolute certainty that these lines did not originally belong to the A-text too and a reference to my note on that line will show that some doubt is allowed here.[1] But I think that Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 are already conclusive in themselves and undoubtedly in their aggregate value sufficient to prove the point.[2]

---

[1] Although the incident of the students coming to look for Faustus' body is in the B.-text (l.l. 2059 seqq.) — whence one might like to conclude that case No. 8 is analogous in this respect to No. 5 — the words ‚came (went) into the hall' constituting the parallelism, are not there.

[2] To any one laying stress on points of divergence between the ballad and the E. F. B., as tending to weaken my argument, I would reply that they will be met by the fact that the same divergences will be found to exist between the ballad and the play. See *e. g. Wittenburge* in l. 5 of the Ballad as against *Rhodes*, Thoms p. 165.

In l. 57 of the Ballad we read: ‚I then did wish both sun and moon to stay', etc. See l.l. 1463 seq. of the play, — whereas there is no apparent equivalent in the play. It will be sufficient here to refer to my note on l.l. 1460 seqq. On that supposition the writer of the ballad and Marlowe would have been in touching mental contact, when transfusing the nonsense of the E. F. B. into sense. It is not impossible that a passage is lost in the E. F. B.

And when we come to think of it, or rather ourselves into it, there is nothing improbable in this notion, nor is this result in reality in contradiction with what Ward and others assure us to have usually taken place. ‚The usual process of the Elizabethan age' — Ward tells us, p. LXV — ‚was .... for dramas to be founded on favourite stories, and for popular ballads ... to summarise the incidents and morals of favourite plays.' In the note, Ward gives us an instance of this process and proceeds to say, in the text, that he cannot ‚see sufficient reason for supposing the sequence to have been different in the present instance.'

Well, I do not think the sequence was different! Let us try to think ourselves into the position of the 16th century ballad-writer, who having witnessed a performance of the play, feels the Muse's approach, but when the divine afflatus was upon him, his memory might perhaps want refreshing, — we can at least imagine that it should be so and we have no occasion to refuse to accept the evidence that points in this direction.

Our man would naturally have turned to the printed text of the play if he could have done so, but our comparison shows that he used the prose-text. These considerations suggest then that shortly before the end of February 1589 (N.S.)

1°. the prose text did exist in print.

2°. the drama did not exist in print, but that

3°. the drama had been acted.

We know now what we have to think of what Ward says (p. LXVII): „Neither before nor in 1589 can any literary materials be conclusively proved to have been in existence of which Marlowe could have availed himself except the...German Faustbuch."! Ward himself calls attention to the fact that the ed.

of 1592 [1]) is a reprint, — so, unless we must take ‚conclusively' to stand for ‚mathematically certain', which here as elsewhere in matters philological is out of the question, we may now look upon this statement as incorrect.

So far then, the conclusion may stand that Marlowe worked on the English prose-text and not *vice versa*. I must here mention — be it only for the sake of completeness — the hypothesis of Dr. J. W. Bruinier, who has lately tried to prove that Marlowe made use of a German play. As I got to know of this hypothesis only when practically the whole of this little work was ready — only the last pages requiring to be written out for the press, I cannot now do more than touch upon the matter. Moreover Dr. Bruinier's work [2]) is apparently not finished yet, and there will therefore be

---

[1]) The first extant ed. is said on the title page to have been translated into English by P. F. Gent. As I recently found the statement — in the catalogue of an antiquary of reputation and actually also in the Anglia (1, 48) by Düntzer! — that *Gent* was the surname of the translator and P. F. the initials of his Christian names, it can do no harm to add that the book was of course translated by a Mr. P... F..., *Gentleman*.

I find no mention made in my printed Faustiana of an ‚edition' apparently anterior to that of Thoms, and published in 1827 by Pickering. To prevent my readers from being puzzled by an announcement of it, as I was, I add that it is a separate print of the corresponding portion of Thoms' Early English Proseromances, *first edition*.

Thoms did not reprint the oldest extant edition, although he knew of its existence. (III, 159.) It is absolutely necessary to make this ed. more widely accessible; I had first intended to reprint it here, but when I heard that it had already been copied out for the purpose of publication by an American lady, I abandoned this plan.

At the moment of going to press I understand that my American correspondent will most likely have to give up her intention, — if this should be confirmed, I shall shortly bring out an edition of the 1592 text, possibly in this same collection.

[2]) See the Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie vol. 29, p.p. 180-195 and 345-372; and vol. 30, p.p. 324-359.

time and occasion enough to reconsider this matter — if necessary, — later on.

I might say of Bruinier's articles what Ward says (p. LX *n.*) of Bielchowsky, one of those who have thought of a German play before, *viz.* that ‚I cannot pretend to have been seriously shaken in the view indicated above' and could even go the length of omitting the word *seriously*, for to say the plain truth I cannot believe anything of it as yet.

Not possessing the necessary material for the investigation, I have no opinion on the question as to whether Bruinier's reconstruction out of the various ‚Puppenspiele' of the ‚archetypus' of his German drama is reliable or not, but for the sake of argument, I wish to accept it as such. This drama m u s t have been used by Marlowe, says Bruinier, (see specially *l. c.* 30, 349) ‚for Marlowe shows the following deviations from Spiess' [1]) and Dr. Bruinier then enumerates some cases in point.

When Bruinier finds a feature common to Marlowe and Widmann, which is found in his German Drama but nót found in ‚Spiess' (by which, be it remembered, Bruinier means Marlowe's source) he concludes that Marlowe múst have found this *trait* in the German Drama, for „Influence of Marlowe on Widmann or *vice versa* influence of Widmann on Marlowe (*i. e.* ‚Marlowe' comprising the additions anterior to 1604) is excluded." [2])

[1]) Dr. Bruinier confesses to not having seen the English prose-text, but having read in Braune's ed. of Spiess that the English text is derived from the first ed. of Spiess, he calmly assumes the two texts to be the same and founds his conclusions regarding Marlowe's work on a comparison of *Spiess*, knowing all the time that Marlowe used the English text!

[2]) „Einwirkung von Marlowe auf Widmann und umgekehrt „(‚Marlowe' im weiteren Sinne, also mit Einschluss der Umar„beitungen vor 1604, verstanden) sind ausgeschlossen". Readers of what precedes will know now what to think of the ‚additions anterior to 1604'.

The weak point here is, that Bruinier has not proved that the influence of Marlowe (1589) on Widmann (1599) is excluded. Why should it be? Considering that the Spiess-text published in 1587 in Germany was used in an English translation by Marlowe early in 1589 (see *ante*, p. 143.), we get a period of ten years for Widman to have become acquainted with Marlowe. Nor should this supposition appear too bold to my readers, for, although we have no actual traces of a printed ed. of the text before 1604, nor any proof of a play on the subject of Dr. Faustus to have been acted in Germany before 1626 (Ward p.LX), the possibility that either should have existed is not excluded and what reason have we to reject the evidence that points towards this conclusion? But although these considerations seem to me to necessarily invalidate whatever argument Bruinier would found on his negation of Marlowe's influence on Widmann, they do not touch his main point, *viz.* that Marlowe must have gone for some points (*viz.* those common to Widmann and his archetypus) to his German Drama. And here again Bruinier's reasoning seems to me singularly weak. For granting, as I said, his archetypus to have had an existence such as he has mapped out for it, Marlowe could only have borrowed from it *if* it existed before Marlowe, and although Bruinier tells us once or twice that some parts ‚cannot' be derived from Marlowe [1]), I can only say that I did not find any proof of it.

And what could have been the reason why Marlowe, having *dramatised* the translation of Spiess, should have turned to the German Drama? [2]) Dr. Bruinier

[1]) See *l. c.* 29, 195, and see *ib.* p. 358: „Entlehnungen sind es (Anklänge an Marlowe) keine Wurzeln".

[2]) Allem Anscheine nach wurde das deutsche Drama erst nach der Dramatisierung der Spiesschen Uebersetzung herangezogen.

does not tell us nor would it be easy, I am afraid, to do so. I should be glad to hear of analogues. In order to make the ‚Marlowians' (for whom he thinks his investigations are ‚tragi-komisch') believe that there is something wrong in their reasoning, Dr. Bruinier will have to adduce some other cases where we see a man dramatising a certain prose-story and then recasting it after an other drama! In itself it is simply incredible.

I must therefore maintain that Marlowe used the English prose-version and that, so far as present evidence goes, this is his only source.

It is instructive to go through the list of his ‚borrowings', because this will enable us to catch a glimpse of his method of setting about his work. I have had to contend more than once (see *e. g.* the notes to l.l. 834, 850 *etc.*) that some lines now found only in B. must be supposed to have originally belonged to Marlowe's work, since otherwise ‚we must assume (the writer of B.) to have gone in for a minute comparison of Marlowe's text with the E. F. B.' (note to l. 834). Now ‚as I have had to state so very often that Marlowe faithfully followed and copied out his source, my readers might conclude that I suppose Marlowe to have done what I have stated to be an unimaginable proceeding for Messrs. Bird and Rowley, *viz.* to have gone ferreting about among the pages of his source to unearth a phrase or two with which to adorn his text. An inspection of these borrowings discloses the interesting fact that Marlowe, having read the prose-text, set about writing his drama, turned to his source only occasionally, and when he did so it was never for one word or one line but always for a longer passage. Sometimes — such as for the compact-scene and the description of the Italian cities — he copies out literally; sometimes, as a comparison

shows, the number of verbal coincidences in one passage or one scene must be owing to his having read it over shortly before dramatising that part of the prose-text. (see *e. g.* scene XI.) The resemblance of isolated words is rare, — I have noticed Rhodes (12); Belsibub (259); possibly: *quid tu* moraris (259); and: pastime (723); see the notes to these lines. These few cases cannot invalidate my argument that Marlowe ‚turned to his source only for a longer passage' for we may suppose the words quoted to have stuck in his memory from the time when he read the text first.

If then, to recapitulate, the various hypotheses, formulated in these Notes, should ultimately prove acceptable, we must conclude that Marlowe wrote his Dr. Faustus — A-text and part of the B-text — sometime in the winter of 1588-1589, having drawn upon the English prose-text only.

INDEX.

N. B. The figures behind the entries in this Index refer to the lines of the text (quoted primarily from Professor Breymann's parallel-edition of A. — the first quarto, 1604 — and B — the third quarto, 1616 — published in 1889 by Messrs. Henninger, at Heilbronn) the notes to which will be found in Chapter I. A reference to the pages of this volume has been adopted for the Second Chapter and for some of the larger notes of Chapter I. In this latter case it is enclosed in square brackets. To facilitate the looking up of the Notes of the B-text, they are followed by a number in brackets which is the one of thát line in the A-text to which that of the B-text corresponds or after which it will be found. E. F. B. means the English prose-text (*E*nglish *F*aust *B*ook) in contradistinction to the G. F. B. which is the *G*erman *F*aust *B*uch. These two abbreviations have been imitated from Th. Delius. The references to the E. F. B. are to Thoms' 2nd edition in vol. III of his Early English Prose Romances, those to the G. F. B. to Braune's ed. (Halle; Niemeyer 1878), unless otherwise indicated.

CONTENTS.